THE

EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.

9224. J. 30-12 / 100

THE EARLY DAYS

OF

CHRISTIANITY.

F P L
VERIFIED
1935

BY

FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.;

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
CANON OF WESTMINSTER; AND CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY
TO THE QUEEN.

πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως.—HEB. i. 1.
ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ.—EPH. iii. 10.

VOL. I.

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO.:
LONDON, PARIS & NEW YORK.

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

1882.

DATA ENTERED

TO

ROBERT BROWNING, Esq.

AUTHOR OF "A DEATH IN THE DESERT,"

AND OF MANY OTHER POEMS OF THE DEEPEST INTEREST TO ALL

STUDENTS OF SCRIPTURE,

I Dedicate

THESE VOLUMES

WITH SINCERE ADMIRATION AND ESTEEM.

PREFACE.

I COMPLETE in these volumes the work which has absorbed such leisure as could be spared from many and onerous duties during the last twelve years. My object has been to furnish English readers with a companion, partly historic and partly expository, to the whole of the New Testament. By attention to the minutest details of the original, by availing myself to the best of my power of the results of modern criticism, by trying to concentrate upon the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists such light as may be derived from Jewish, Pagan, or Christian sources, I have endeavoured to fulfil my ordination vow and to show diligence in such studies as help to the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. The "Life of Christ" was intended mainly as a commentary upon the Gospels. It was written in such a form as should reproduce whatever I had been able to learn from the close examination of every word which they contain, and should at the same time set forth the living reality of the scenes recorded. In the "Life of St. Paul" I wished to incorporate the details of the Acts of the Apostles with such biographical incidents as can be derived from the Epistles of St. Paul; and to take

the reader through the Epistles themselves in a way which might enable him, with keener interest, to judge of their separate purpose and peculiarities, by grasping the circumstances under which each of them was written. The present volumes are an attempt to set forth, in their distinctive characteristics, the work and the writings of St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude, St. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. If my effort has been in any degree successful, the reader should carry away from these pages some conception of the varieties of religious thought which prevailed in the schools of Jerusalem and of Alexandria, and also of those phases of theology which are represented by the writings of the two greatest of the twelve Apostles.

In carrying out this design I have gone, almost verse by verse, through the seven Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation of St. John—explaining their special difficulties, and developing their general characteristics. Among many Christians there is a singular ignorance of the Books of Scripture as a whole. With a wide knowledge of particular texts, there is a strange lack of familiarity with the bearings of each separate Gospel and Epistle. I have hoped that by considering each book in connexion with all that we can learn of its author, and of the circumstances under which it was written, I might perhaps contribute to the intelligent study of Holy Writ. There may be some truth in the old motto, *Bonus textuarius bonus theologus;* but he whose knowledge is *confined* to "texts," and who has never

studied them, first with their context, then as forming fragments of entire books, and lastly in their relation to the whole of Scripture, incurs the risk of turning theology into an erroneous and artificial system. It is thus that the Bible has been misinterpreted by substituting words for things; by making the dead letter an instrument wherewith to murder the living spirit; and by reading into Scripture a multitude of meanings which it was never intended to express. Words, like the chameleon, change their colour with their surroundings. The very same word may in different ages involve almost opposite connotations. The vague and differing notions attached to the same term have been the most fruitful sources of theological bitterness, and of the internecine opposition of contending sects. The abuse of sacred phrases has been the cause, in age after age, of incredible misery and mischief. Texts have been perverted to sharpen the sword of the tyrant and to strengthen the rod of the oppressor—to kindle the fagot of the Inquisitor and to rivet the fetters of the slave. The terrible wrongs which have been inflicted upon mankind in their name have been due exclusively to their isolation and perversion. The remedy for these deadly evils would have been found in the due study and comprehension of Scripture as a whole. The Bible does not all lie at a dead level of homogeneity and uniformity. It is a progressive revelation. Its many-coloured wisdom was made known "fragmentarily and multifariously"—in many parts and in many manners.

In the endeavour to give a clearer conception of

the books here considered I have followed such different methods as each particular passage seemed to require. I have sometimes furnished a very close and literal translation; sometimes a free paraphrase; sometimes a rapid abstract; sometimes a running commentary. Avoiding all parade of learned references, I have thought that the reader would generally prefer the brief expression of a definite opinion to the reiteration of many bewildering theories. Neither in these, nor in the previous volumes, have I wilfully or consciously avoided a single difficulty. A passing sentence often expresses a conclusion which has only been formed after the study of long and tedious monographs. In the foot-notes especially I have compressed into the smallest possible space what seemed to be most immediately valuable for the illustration of particular words or allusions. In the choice of readings I have exercised an independent judgment. If my choice coincides in most instances with that of the Revisers of the New Testament, this has only arisen from the fact that I have been guided by the same principles as they were. These volumes, like the "Life of Christ" and the "Life of St. Paul," were written before the readings adopted by the Revisers were known, and without the assistance which I should otherwise have derived from their invaluable labours.*

The purpose which I have had in view has been, I trust, in itself a worthy one, however much I may have

* I take this opportunity of thanking the Rev. John de Soyres and Mr. W. R. Brown for the assistance which they have rendered in preparing this book for the press.

failed in its execution. A living writer of eminence has spoken of his works in terms which, in very humble measure, I would fain apply to my own. "I have made," said Cardinal Newman—in a speech delivered in 1879—"many mistakes. I have nothing of that high perfection which belongs to the writings of the saints, namely, that error cannot be found in them. But what, I trust, I may claim throughout all I have written is this—an honest intention; an absence of personal ends; a temper of obedience; a willingness to be corrected; a dread of error; a desire to serve the Holy Church; and" (though this is perhaps more than I have any right to say) "through the Divine mercy a fair measure of success."

F. W. FARRAR.

St. Margaret's Rectory, Westminster,
June 7th, 1882.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Book I.

THE WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

MORAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD.

PAGE

Degradations which accompanied the Decadence of Paganism—The Slaves—The Rich and Noble—The Emperor—Fatal Degeneracy—Greeklings—Literature, Art, the Drama—The Senate—Scepticism and Superstition—Stoic Virtue—The Holy Joy of Christians 1

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE OF THE ANTICHRIST.

The Nemesis of Absolutism—Reign of Nero—Christians and the Roman Government—St. Paul and the Empire—Horrors of Cæsarism—The Palace of the Antichrist—Agrippina the Younger—Infancy of Nero—Evil Auguries—Intrigues of Agrippina—Her Marriage with Claudius—Her Career as Empress—Her Plots to Advance her Son—Her Crimes—Her Peril—Murder of Claudius—Accession of Nero 17

CHAPTER III.

THE FEATURES OF THE ANTICHRIST.

Successful Guilt—Fresh Crimes—The "Golden *Quinquennium*"—Follies of Nero—Threats of Agrippina—Jealousy of Britannicus—Murder of Britannicus—Nero estranged from Agrippina—Influence of Poppaea—Plot to Murder Agrippina—Burrus and Seneca—Murder of Agrippina—A Tormented Conscience—The Depths of Satan 35

CHAPTER IV.

THE BURNING OF ROME, AND THE FIRST PERSECUTION.

The Era of Martyrdom—The Fire of Rome—Was Nero Guilty?—Devastation of the City—Confusion and Agony—The Golden House—Nero Sus-

PAGE

pected—The Christians Accused—Strangeness of this Circumstance—Tacitus—Popular Feeling against the Christians—Secret Jewish Suggestions—Poppæa a Proselyte—Incendiarism attributed to Christians—Æsthetic Cruelty—A Huge Multitude—Dreadful Forms of Martyrdom—Martyrs on the Stage—The Antichrist—Retribution—Awful Omens—The Revolt of Vindex—Suicide of Nero—Expectation of his Return 51

Book II.

ST. PETER AND THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

CHAPTER V.

Writings of the Apostles and Early Christians.

Annals of the Church—End of the Acts—Obscurity of Details—Little known about the Apostles—St. Andrew—St. Bartholomew—St. Matthew—St. Thomas—St. James the Less—St. Simon Zelotes—Judas—Late and Scanty Records—Writings of the Great Apostles—Invaluable as illustrating different Phases of Christian Thought—They Explain the opposite Tendencies of Heretical Development—The Revelation—The Epistle to the Hebrews—The Seven Catholic Epistles—The Epistle of St. Jude—The Epistle of St. James—The Epistles of St. Peter—Catholicity of St. Peter—The Three Epistles of St. John—Genuineness of these Writings—Contrasts between different Apostles—Difference between St. Paul and St. John—Superiority of the New Testament to the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers—The Epistle of St. Clemens—Its Theological and Intellectual Weakness—The Epistle of Barnabas—Its exaggerated Paulinism—Its extravagant Exegesis—The Christian Church was not ideally Pure—Yet its Chief Glory was in the Holiness of its Standard 81

CHAPTER VI.

St. Peter.

Outline of his early Life—Events recorded in the Acts—Complete Uncertainty as to his Subsequent Career—Legends—*Domine quo vadis?*—The Legends embellished and Doubtful—Legend about Simon Magus—Was Peter Bishop of Rome?—Improbability of the Legend about his Crucifixion head downwards—His Martyrdom—His Visit to Rome . 109

CHAPTER VII.

Special Features of the First Epistle of St. Peter.

PAGE

Date of the Epistle—Its certain Genuineness—Style of the Epistle—A Christian Treatise—Natural Allusions to Events in the Gospels—Vivid Expressions—Resemblance to the Speeches in the Acts—Allusions to the Law—Resemblances to St. Paul and St. James—Plasticity of St. Peter's Nature—Struggle after Unity—Originality—His View of Redemption—His View of Faith—His Views upon Regeneration and Baptism—Not Transcendental but Practical—Christ's Descent into Hades—Great Importance of the Doctrine—Attempts to explain it away—Reference to the Epistle to the Galatians—Addressed to both Jews and Gentiles—Crisis at which it was Composed—A Time of Persecution—Keynote of the Letter—Analysis 121

CHAPTER VIII.

The First Epistle of St. Peter.

Title which he Adopts—Address—Provinces of Asia—Thanksgiving—Exhortation to Hope—Special Appeals—Duty of Blameless Living—Duty of Civil Obedience—Humble Submission—Address to Servants—To Christian Wives—Exhortation to Love and Unity—Christ Preaching to the Spirits in Prison—Obvious Import of the Passage—Ruthlessness of Commentators—The approaching End—Address to Elders—Conclusion 151

CHAPTER IX.

Peculiarities of the Second Epistle.

Overpositiveness in the Attack and Defence of its Genuineness—Its Canonicity—Exaggeration of the Arguments urged in its Favour—Extreme Weakness of external Evidence—Tardy Acceptance of the Epistle—Views of St. Jerome, &c.—Cessation of Criticism—The Unity of its Structure—Outline of the Letter—Internal Evidence—Resemblances to First Epistle—Difference of Style—Peculiarity of its Expressions—Difference in general Form of Thought—Irrelevant Arguments about the Style—Marked Variations—Dr. Abbott's Proof of the Resemblance to Josephus—Could Josephus have Read it?—Reference to the Second Advent—What may be urged against these Difficulties—Priority of St. Jude—Extraordinary Relation to St. Jude—Method of Dealing with the stranger Phenomena of St. Jude's Epistle—Possible Counter-considerations—Allusion to the Transfiguration—Ancientness of the Epistle—Superiority of the Epistle to the Post-Apostolic Writings—The Thoughts may have been Sanctioned and Adopted by St. Peter . 171

CHAPTER X.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

PAGE

Reasons for offering a Literal Translation of the Epistle—Translation and Notes—Abrupt Conclusion 209

CHAPTER XI.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

Its Authenticity—Who was the Author?—Jude, the Brother of James—Not an Apostle—One of the Brethren of the Lord—Why he does not use this Title—Why he calls himself "Brother of James?"—Story of his Grandchildren—Circumstances which may have called forth the Epistle—Corruption of Morals—Who were the Offenders thus Denounced?—Resemblances to Second Epistle of St. Péter—Translation and Notes—Style of Greek—Simplicity of Structure—Fondness for Apocryphal Allusions—Methods of Dealing with these Peculiarities—"Verbal Dictation"—Rabbinic Legends—Corrupt, Gnosticising Sects 220

Book III.

APOLLOS, ALEXANDRIAN CHRISTIANITY, AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER XII.

JUDAISM, THE SEPTUAGINT, ETC.

Unity of Christian Faith—Diversity in Unity—Necessity and Blessing of the Diversity—Individuality of the Sacred Writers—Phases of Christian Truth—*Alexandrian Christianity*—The Jews and Greek Philosophy—Hebraism and Hellenism—Glories of Alexandria—Prosperity of the Jews in Alexandria—The Diapleuston—Favour shown the Jews by the Ptolemies—The Septuagint—Delight of the Hellenists—Anger of the Hebraists—Effects on Judaism—Bias of the Translators—Harmless Variations from the Hebrew—Hagadoth—Avoidance of Anthropomorphism and Anthropopathy—Deliberate Manipulation of the Original—Aristobulus—The Wisdom of Solomon—Semi-Ethnic Jewish Literature—Philo not wholly Original 247

CHAPTER XIII.

PHILO AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS.

Family of Alexander the Alabarch—Life of Philo—Classification of his

PAGE

Works—Those that bear on the Creation—On Abraham—Allegorising Fancies—The Life of Moses—Arbitrary Exegesis—Meanings of the word Logos—Personification of the Logos—The High Priest—A Cup-bearer—Other Comparisons—Vague Outlines of the Conception—Contrast with St. John 266

CHAPTER XIV.

PHILONISM—ALLEGORY—THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL.

Influence of Philo on the Sacred Writers—Sapiential Literature of Alexandria—Defects of Philonism—The School of St. Mark—Motto of the Alexandrian School—Allegory applied to the Old Testament—The *Pardes* of the Kabbalists—History of Allegory in the Alexandrian School—Allegory in the Western Church 277

CHAPTER XV.

AUTHORSHIP AND STYLE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Continuity of Scripture—Manifoldness of Wisdom—Ethnic Inspiration—The Epistle Alexandrian—External Evidence—Summary—Superficial Custom—Misuse of Authorities—Later Doubts and Hesitations—Indolent Custom—Phrases common to the Author with St. Paul—Differences of Style not explicable—The Epistle not a Translation—Fondness of the Writer for Sonorous Amplifications 285

CHAPTER XVI.

THEOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Difference from the Theological Conceptions of St. Paul—Three Cardinal Topics—"The People"—Christianity and Judaism—Alexandrianism of the Writer—Prominence of the Jews—Method of treating Scripture—Indebtedness to Philo—Particular Expressions—"The Utter-Word"—Stern Passages—Melchizedek-Priesthood of Christ—Superiority to Philo—Fundamental Alexandrianism—Judaism not regarded as a Law but as a System of Worship—"The Pattern shewn thee in the Mount"—Effectiveness of the Argument—A Præ-existent Ideal—The World of Ideas—View of HOPE—FAITH, in this Epistle and in St. Paul—RIGHTEOUSNESS—CHRISTOLOGY—REDEMPTION—Prominence given to PRIESTHOOD and SACRIFICE—Peculiar Sentences—The Author could not have been St. Paul 301

CHAPTER XVII.

WHO WROTE THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS?

Absence of Greeting—Certainties about the Writer—By some known Friend

PAGE

of St. Paul—Yet not by AQUILA—Nor by TITUS—Nor by SILAS—Nor by ST. BARNABAS—Nor by ST. CLEMENS OF ROME—Nor by ST. MARK—Nor by ST. LUKE—Strong Probability that the Writer was APOLLOS—This would not necessarily be known to the Church of Alexandria—Suggested by Luther—Generally and increasingly Accepted—Date of the Epistle—Allusion to Timothy—Addressed to Jewish Christians—Not Addressed to the Church of Jerusalem—Nor to Corinth—Nor to Alexandria—May have been Addressed to Rome—Or to Ephesus—"They of Italy"—Apollos 330

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION I.

THE SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST.

Comparison between Judaism and Christianity—Outline of the Epistle—Its Keynotes—Striking Opening—Christ Superior to Angels—Peculiar Method of Scriptural Argument—Use of Quotations—An Admitted Method—Partial Change of View—The Style of Argument less important to us 346

SECTION II.

A SOLEMN EXHORTATION.

Translation and Notes—Christ Superior to Moses—Parallelism of Structure—Appeal 358

SECTION III.

THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

Transitional Exhortation—Qualifications of High Priesthood—Sketch of the great Argument of the Epistle—Translation and Notes—Explanation of Difficulties respecting the Nature of Christ—Digression—Post-Baptismal Sin—Indefectibility of Grace—Calvinistic View of the Passage—Arminian View—Neither View Tenable—Obvious Limitations of the Meaning of the Passage—"Near a Curse"—"For Burning"—A Better Hope 368

SECTION IV.

THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK.

Translation and Notes—All that is known of Melchizedek—Salem—*El*

PAGE

Elîôn—Allusion in Psalm cx.—Hagadoth—Philo—Mystery attached to Melchizedek—Fantastic Hypotheses—Who Melchizedek was—Only Important as a Type—Semitic Phraseology and Modes of Arguing from the Silence of Scripture—Translation and Notes—Argument of the Passage—Superiority of the Melchizedek to the Levitic Priesthood in Seven Particulars—Summary and Notes 391

SECTION V.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

Grandeur of the Day—Translation and Notes—A New Covenant—Its Superior Ordinances of Ministration—Translation and Notes—Symbolism of Service—The Tabernacle, not the Temple—"*Vacua omnia*"—Contents of the Ark—The *Thumiaterion*—Censer (?)—Altar of Incense—Translation and Notes—Meanings of the word *Diatheke*—An obvious Play on its Second Meaning of "Testament"—Translation and Notes—Familiarity with the Hagadoth and the Halacha—Grandest Phase of Levitic Priesthood—Feelings Inspired by the Day—Careful Preparation of the High Priest—Legendary Additions to the Ritual—Peril of the Function—Chosen as the Highest Point of Comparison—Superiority of Christian Privileges in every respect 409

SECTION VI.

A RECAPITULATION.

Translation and Notes—Triumphant Close of the Argument—Summary . 440

SECTION VII.

A THIRD SOLEMN WARNING.

Exhortation—Its Solemnity—Translation and Notes 446

SECTION VIII.

THE GLORIES OF FAITH.

FAITH—What is Faith?—Exhibited in its Issues—Beginning of the Illustration—Instances from each Period of Sacred History—Translation and Notes 451

SECTION IX.

FINAL EXHORTATIONS.

Exhortation to Endurance—God's Fatherhood—Translation and Notes—Faith and Patience—Superior Grandeur of Christianity—Moral Appeal

PAGE

of the last Chapter—Translation and Notes—Modern Controversies—"We have an Altar"—Explanation of the Passage—Exhortation to Obedience—Final Clauses—Their Bearing on the Authorship of the Epistle 461

Book IV.

JUDAIC CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER XIX.

"THE LORD'S BROTHER."

A New Phase of Christianity—The Name "James"—The Author was not James the Son of Zebedee—Untenable Arguments—Nor James the Son of Alphæus—Untenable Arguments—Alphæus—He is James, Bishop of Jerusalem, and the Lord's Brother—Is he Identical with the Son of Alphæus?—"Neither did His Brethren Believe on Him"—Paucity of Jewish Names—Helvidian Theory—The Simplest and Fairest Explanation of the Language of the Evangelists—The Language not Absolutely Decisive—Dogma of the *Aeiparthenia*—The Evangelists give no Hint of it—What the Gospels Say—Utter Baselessness of the Theory of St. Jerome—Entirely Untrue that the Terms "Cousins" and "Brothers" are Identical—The Theory an Invention due to *à priori* Conceptions—Not a single Argument can be Adduced in its favour—Tendencies which Led to the Dogma of the *Aeiparthenia*—Unscriptural and Manichæan Disparagement of the Sanctity of Marriage—The Theory arises from Apollinarian Tendencies—Theory of Epiphanius—Derived from the Apocryphal Gospels—Their Absurdities and Discrepancies—Conclusion 483

CHAPTER XX.

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF ST. JAMES.

Inimitable Truthfulness of Scripture Narrative—Childhood and Training of St. James—A Boy's Education—"A Just Man"—Levitic Precision—The Home at Nazareth—Familiarity with Scripture—"Wisdom"—Knowledge of Apocryphal Books—Curious Phenomenon—A Nazarite—Scrupulous Holiness—A Lifelong Vow—Shadows over the Home at Nazareth—Alienation of Christ's "Brethren"—Their Interferences—

PAGE

His Calm and Gentle Rebukes—Their Last Interference—Their Complete Conversion—Due to the Resurrection—"He was Seen of James"—Legend in the Gospel of the Hebrews—St. James and St. Paul—Death of the Son of Zebedee—James, Bishop of Jerusalem—Deep Reverence for his Character—*Obliam*—St. James and St. Peter—Bearing of St. James in the Synod of Jerusalem—Wisdom which he Showed—Importance of the Question at stake—His Decision—Its Results—"Certain from James"—A Favourite of the Ebionites—Judaic Type of his Character and of his Views—The Results of his Training—"The Just"—Title which he Adopts—Unfortunate Advice to St. Paul—Martyrdom of St. James—Josephus—Hegesippus—Narrative of Hegesippus—Talmudic Legends of St. James—Rapid Retribution 510

Book I.

THE WORLD.

THE EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Book I.

THE WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

MORAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD.

"Quem vocet divum populus ruentis
Imperî rebus? prece qua fatigent
Virgines sanctae minus audientem
Carmina Vestam?"
—HOR. *Od.* I. ii. 25.

"Nona aetas agitur pejoraque saecula ferri
Temporibus, quorum sceleri non invenit ipsa
Nomen, et a nullo posuit natura metallo."
—JUV. *Sat.* xiii. 28—30.

"From Mummius to Augustus the Roman city stands as the living mistress of a dead world, and from Augustus to Theodosius the mistress becomes as lifeless as her subjects."—FREEMAN'S *Essays*, ii. 330.

THE epoch which witnessed the early growth of Christianity was an epoch of which the horror and the degradation have rarely been equalled, and perhaps never exceeded, in the annals of mankind. Were we to form our sole estimate of it from the lurid picture of its wickedness, which St. Paul in more than one passage has painted with a few powerful strokes, we might suppose that we were judging it from too lofty a standpoint. We might be accused of throwing too dark a shadow upon the crimes of Paganism, when we set it as a foil to the lustre of an ideal holiness. But even if St. Paul

had never paused amid his sacred reasonings to affix his terrible brand upon the pride of Heathenism, there would still have been abundant proofs of the abnormal wickedness which accompanied the decadence of ancient civilisation. They are stamped upon its coinage, cut on its gems, painted upon its chamber-walls, sown broadcast over the pages of its poets, satirists, and historians. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant!" Is there any age which stands so instantly condemned by the bare mention of its rulers as that which recalls the successive names of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, and which after a brief gleam of better examples under Vespasian and Titus, sank at last under the hideous tyranny of a Domitian? Is there any age of which the evil characteristics force themselves so instantaneously upon the mind as that of which we mainly learn the history and moral condition from the relics of Pompeii and Herculaneum, the satires of Persius and Juvenal, the epigrams of Martial, and the terrible records of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius? And yet even beneath this lowest deep, there is a lower deep; for not even on their dark pages are the depths of Satan so shamelessly laid bare to human gaze as they are in the sordid fictions of Petronius and of Apuleius. But to dwell upon the crimes and the retributive misery of that period is happily not my duty. I need but make a passing allusion to its enormous wealth; its unbounded self-indulgence; its coarse and tasteless luxury; its greedy avarice; its sense of insecurity and terror;[1] its apathy,

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 10; "Interciderat sortis humanae commercium vi metûs," Tac. *Ann.* vi. 19; "Pavor internus occupaverat animos," *id.* iv. 76. See the very remarkable passage of Pliny ("At Hercule homini plurima ex homine mala sunt," *H. N.* vii. 1).

debauchery, and cruelty;[1] its hopeless fatalism;[2] its unspeakable sadness and weariness;[3] its strange extravagances alike of infidelity and of superstition.[4]

At the lowest extreme of the social scale were millions of slaves, without family, without religion, without possessions, who had no recognised rights, and towards whom none had any recognised duties, passing normally from a childhood of degradation to a manhood of hardship, and an old age of unpitied neglect.[5] Only a little above the slaves stood the lower classes, who formed the vast majority of the freeborn inhabitants of the Roman Empire. They were, for the most part, beggars and idlers, familiar with the grossest indignities of an unscrupulous dependence. Despising a life of honest industry, they

[1] Mart. *Ep.* ii. 66; Juv. vi. 491.

[2] Lucan, *Phars.* i. 70, 81; Suet. *Tib.* 69; Tac. *Agric.* 42; *Ann.* iii. 18, iv. 26; "Sed mihi haec et talia audienti in incerto judicium est, fatone res mortalium et necessitate immutabili an forte volvantur," *Ann.* vi. 22; Plin. *H. N.* ii. 7; Sen. *De Benef.* iv. 7.

[3] Tacitus, with all his resources, finds it difficult to vary his language in describing so many suicides.

[4] See my *Witness of History to Christ*, p. 101; *Seekers after God*, p. 38. The "taurobolies" and "kriobolies" (baths in the blood of bulls and rams) mark the extreme sensuality of superstition. See Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, ii. 179; De Pressensé, *Trois Premiers Siècles*, ii. 1—60, etc.

[5] Some of the *loci classici* on Roman slavery are: Cic. *De Rep.* xiv. 23; Juv. vi. 219, x. 183, xiv. 16—24; Sen. *Ep.* 47; *De Irâ*, iii. 35, 40; *De Clem.* 18; *Controv.* v. 33; *De Vit. Beat.* 17; Plin. *H. N.* xxxiii. 11; Plut. *Cato*, 21. Vedius Pollio and the lampreys (Plin. *H. N.* ix. 23). In the debate on the murder of Pedanius Secundus (Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 42—45) many eminent senators openly advocated the brutal law that when a master was murdered, his slaves, often to the number of hundreds, should be put to death. These facts, and many others, will be found collected in Wallon, *De l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*; Friedländer, *Sittengesch. Roms*; Becker, *Gallus*, E. T. 199—225; Döllinger, *Judenth. u. Heidenth.* ix. 1, § 2. It is reckoned that in the Empire there cannot have been fewer than 60,000,000 slaves (Le Maistre, *Du Pape*, i. 283). They were so numerous as to be divided according to their nationalities (Tac. *Ann.* iii. 53), and every slave was regarded as a potential enemy (Sen. *Ep.* xlvii.).

asked only for bread and the games of the Circus, and were ready to support any Government, even the most despotic, if it would supply these needs. They spent their mornings in lounging about the Forum, or in dancing attendance at the levées of patrons, for a share in whose largesses they daily struggled.[1] They spent their afternoons and evenings in gossiping at the Public Baths, in listlessly enjoying the polluted plays of the theatre, or looking with fierce thrills of delighted horror at the bloody sports of the arena. At night, they crept up to their miserable garrets in the sixth and seventh stories of the huge *insulae*—the lodging-houses of Rome—into which, as into the low lodging-houses of the poorer quarters of London, there drifted all that was most wretched and most vile.[2] Their life, as it is described for us by their contemporaries, was largely made up of squalor, misery, and vice.

Immeasurably removed from these needy and greedy freemen, and living chiefly amid crowds of corrupted and obsequious slaves, stood the constantly diminishing throng of the wealthy and the noble.[3] Every age in its decline has exhibited the spectacle of selfish luxury side by side with abject poverty; of—

> "Wealth, a monster gorged
> Mid starving populations:"—

but nowhere, and at no period, were these contrasts so startling as they were in Imperial Rome. There a whole

[1] Suet. *Ner.* 16; Mart. iv. 8, viii. 50; Juv. i. 100, 128, iii. 269, etc.

[2] Juv. *Sat.* iii. 60—65; Athen. i. 17, § 36; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, "quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt;" Vitruv. ii. 8; Suet. *Ner.* 38. There were 44,000 *insulae* in Rome to only 1,780 *domus* (Becker, *Gallus*, E. T., p. 232).

[3] Among the 1,200,000 inhabitants of ancient Rome, even in Cicero's time, there were scarcely 2,000 proprietors (Cic. *De Off.* ii. 21).

population might be trembling lest they should be starved by the delay of an Alexandrian corn-ship, while the upper classes were squandering a fortune at a single banquet,[1] drinking out of myrrhine and jewelled vases worth hundreds of pounds,[2] and feasting on the brains of peacocks and the tongues of nightingales.[3] As a consequence disease was rife, men were short-lived, and even women became liable to gout.[4] Over a large part of Italy, most of the freeborn population had to content themselves, even in winter, with a tunic, and the luxury of a toga was reserved only, by way of honour, to the corpse.[5] Yet at this very time, the dress of Roman ladies displayed an unheard-of splendour. The elder Pliny tells us that he himself saw Lollia Paulina dressed for a betrothal feast in a robe entirely covered with pearls and emeralds, which had cost forty million sesterces,[6] and which was known to be less costly than some of her other dresses.[7] Gluttony, caprice,

1 See Tac. *Ann.* iii. 55. 400,000 sesterces (Juv. xi. 19). Taking the standard of 100,000 sesterces to be in the Augustan age £1,080 (which is a little below the calculation of Hultsch), this would be £4,320. 30,000,000 sesterces (Sen. *Ep.* xcv.; Sen. *ad Helv.* 9). In the days of Tiberius three mullets had sold for 30,000 sesterces (Suet. *Tib.* 34). Even in the days of Pompey Romans had adopted the disgusting practice of preparing for a dinner by taking an emetic. Vitellius set on the table at one banquet 2,000 fish and 7,000 birds, and in less than eight months spent in feasts a sum that would now amount to several millions.

2 Plin. *H. N.* viii. 48, xxxvii. 18.

3 "Portenta luxuriae," Sen. *Ep.* cx.; Plin. *H. N.* ix. 18, 32, x. 51, 72. Petron. 93; Juv. xi. 1—55, v. 92—100; Macrob. *Sat.* iii. 12, 13; Sen. *Ep.* lxxxix. 21; Mart. *Ep.* lxx. 5; Lampridius, *Elagab.* 20; Suet. *Vitell.* 13. On the luxury of the age in general, see Sen. *De Brev. Vit.* 12; *Ep.* xcv.

4 Sen. *Ep.* xcv. 15—29. At Herculaneum many of the rolls discovered were cookery books.

5 Juv. i. 171; Mart. ix. 58, 8.

6 £432,000.

7 Pliny, *H. N.* ix. 35, 56. He also saw Agrippina in a robe of gold tissue, *id.* xxxiii. 19.

extravagance, ostentation, impurity, rioted in the heart of a society which knew of no other means by which to break the monotony of its weariness, or alleviate the anguish of its despair.

> "On that hard Pagan world disgust
>   And secret loathing fell;
> Deep weariness and sated lust
>   Made human life a hell.
> In his cool hall, with haggard eyes,
>   The Roman noble lay;
> He drove abroad in furious guise
>   Along the Appian Way;
> He made a feast, drank fierce and fast,
>   And crowned his hair with flowers—
> No easier nor no quicker past
>   The impracticable hours."

At the summit of the whole decaying system—necessary, yet detested—elevated indefinitely above the very highest, yet living in dread of the very lowest, oppressing a population which he terrified, and terrified by the population which he oppressed[1]—was an Emperor, raised to the divinest pinnacle of autocracy, yet conscious that his life hung upon a thread;[2]—an Emperor who, in the terrible phrase of Gibbon, was at once a priest, an atheist, and a god.[3]

The general condition of society was such as might have been expected from the existence of these elements. The Romans had entered on a stage of fatal degeneracy

[1] Juv. iv. 153; Suet. *Domit.* 17.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* vi. 6; Suet. *Claud.* 35.

[3] "Coelum decretum," Tac. *Ann.* i. 73; "Dis aequa potestas Caesaris," Juv. iv. 71; Plin. *Paneg.* 74–5, "Civitas nihil felicitati suae putat adstrui, posse nisi ut *Di Caesarem imitentur.*" (Cf. Suet. *Jul.* 88; *Tib.* 13, 58; *Aug.* 59; *Calig.* 33; *Vesp.* 23; *Domit.* 13.) Lucan, vii. 456; Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium passim*; Dion Cass. lxiii. 5, 20; Martial, *passim*; Tert. *Apol.* 33, 34; Boissier, *La Rel. Romaine,* i. 122—208.

from the first day of their close intercourse with Greece.[1] Greece learnt from Rome her cold-blooded cruelty; Rome learnt from Greece her voluptuous corruption. Family life among the Romans had once been a sacred thing, and for 520 years divorce had been unknown among them.[2] Under the Empire marriage had come to be regarded with disfavour and disdain.[3] Women, as Seneca says, married in order to be divorced, and were divorced in order to marry; and noble Roman matrons counted the years not by the Consuls, but by their discarded or discarding husbands.[4]

To have a family was regarded as a misfortune, because the childless were courted with extraordinary assiduity by crowds of fortune-hunters.[5] When there were children in a family, their education was left to be begun under the tutelage of those slaves who were otherwise the most decrepit and useless,[6] and was carried on, with results too fatally obvious, by supple, accomplished, and abandoned Greeklings.[7] But indeed no system of education could have eradicated the influence of the domestic circle. No care[8] could have prevented

[1] The degeneracy is specially traceable in their literature from the days of Plautus onwards.

[2] The first Roman recorded to have divorced his wife was Sp. Carvilius Ruga, B.C. 234 (Dionys. ii. 25; Aul. Gell. xvii. 21).

[3] Hor. *Od.* iii. 6, 17. "Raraque in hoc aevo quae velit esse parens." Ov. *Nux*, 15. Hence the Lex Papia Poppaea, the Jus trium liberorum, etc. Suet. *Oct.* 34; Aul. Gell. i. 6. See Champagny, *Les Césars*, i. 258, *seq.*

[4] "Non consulum numero sed maritorum annos suos computant," Sen. *De Benef.* iii. 16; "Repudium jam votum erat, et quasi matrimonii fructus," Tert. *Apol.* 6; "Corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum vocatur," Tac. *Germ.* 19. Comp. Suet. *Calig.* 34.

[5] Tac. *Germ.* 20; *Ann.* xiii. 52; Plin. H. N. xiv. *proœm*; Sen. *ad Marc. Consol.* 19; Plin. *Epp.* iv. 16; Juv. *Sat.* xii. 114, *seq.*

[6] Plut. *De Lib. Educ.*

[7] Juv. vii. 187, 219.

[8] Juv. *Sat.* xiv.

the sons and daughters of a wealthy family from catching the contagion of the vices of which they saw in their parents a constant and unblushing example.[1]

Literature and art were infected with the prevalent degradation. Poetry sank in great measure into exaggerated satire, hollow declamation, or frivolous epigrams. Art was partly corrupted by the fondness for glare, expensiveness, and size,[2] and partly sank into miserable triviality, or immoral prettinesses,[3] such as those which decorated the walls of Pompeii in the first century, and the Parc aux Cerfs in the eighteenth. Greek statues of the days of Phidias were ruthlessly decapitated, that their heads might be replaced by the scowling or imbecile features of a Gaius or a Claudius. Nero, professing to be a connoisseur, thought that he improved the Alexander of Lysimachus by gilding it from head to foot. Eloquence, deprived of every legitimate aim, and used almost solely for purposes of insincere display, was tempted to supply the lack of genuine fire by sonorous euphony and theatrical affectation. A training in rhetoric was now understood to be a training in the art of emphasis and verbiage, which was rarely used for any loftier purpose than to make sycophancy plausible, or to embellish sophistry with speciousness.[4] The Drama, even in Horace's days, had degenerated into a vehicle for

[1] Juv. *Sat.* xiv. *passim*; Tac. *De Orat.* 28, 29; Quinct. i. 2; Sen. *De Irâ*, ii. 22; *Ep.* 95.

[2] It was the age of Colossi (Plin. *H. N.* xxxiv. 7; Mart. *Ep.* i. 71, viii. 44; Stat. *Sylv.* i. 1, etc.).

[3] Ῥωπογραφία. Cic. *Att.* xv. 16; Plin. xxxv. 37. See Champagny, *Les Césars*, iv. 138, who refers to Vitruv. vii. 5; Propert. ii. 5; Plin. *H. N.* xiv. 22, and xxxv. 10 (the painter Arellius, etc.).

[4] Tac. *Dial.* 36—41; *Ann.* xv. 71; Sen. *Ep.* cvi. 12; Petron. *Satyr.* i. Dion Cass. lix. 20.

the exhibition of scenic splendour or ingenious machinery. Dignity, wit, pathos, were no longer expected on the stage, for the dramatist was eclipsed by the swordsman or the rope-dancer.[1] The actors who absorbed the greatest part of popular favour were pantomimists, whose insolent prosperity was generally in direct proportion to the infamy of their character.[2] And while the shamelessness of the theatre corrupted the purity of all classes from the earliest age,[3] the hearts of the multitude were made hard as the nether millstone with brutal insensibility, by the fury of the circus, the atrocities of the amphitheatre, and the cruel orgies of the games.[4] Augustus, in the document annexed to his will, mentioned that he had exhibited 8,000 gladiators and 3,510 wild beasts. The old warlike spirit of the Romans was dead among the gilded youth of families in which distinction of any kind was certain to bring down upon its most prominent members the murderous

[1] Juv. xiv. 250; Suet. *Nero*, 11; *Galb*. 6.

[2] Mnester (Tac. *Ann*. xi. 4, 36); Paris (Juv. vi. 87, vii. 88); Aliturus (Jos. *Vit*. 3); Pylades (Zosim. i. 6); Bathyllus (Dion Cass. liv. 17; Tac. *Ann*. i. 54).

[3] Isidor. xviii. 39.

[4] "Mera homicidia sunt," Sen. *Ep*. vii. 2; "Nihil est nobis . . . cum insaniâ circi, cum impudicitia theatri, cum atrocitate arenae, cum vanitate xysti." Tert. *Apol*. 38. Cicero inclined to the prohibition of games which imperilled life (*De Legg*. ii. 15), and Seneca (*l. c.*) expressed his compassionate disapproval, and exposed the falsehood and sophism of the plea that after all the sufferers were only criminals. Yet in the days of Claudius the number of those thus butchered was so great that the statue of Augustus had to be moved that it might not constantly be covered with a veil (Dion Cass. lx. 13, who in the same chapter mentions a lion that had been trained to devour men). In Claudius's sham sea-fight we are told that the incredible number of 19,000 men fought each other (Tac. *Ann*. xii. 56). Titus, the "darling of the human race," in one day brought into the theatre 5,000 wild beasts (Suet. *Tit*. 7), and butchered thousands of Jews in the games at Berytus. In Trajan's games (Dion Cass. lxviii. 15) 11,000 animals and 10,000 men had to fight.

suspicion of irresponsible despots. The spirit which had once led the Domitii and the Fabii "to drink delight of battle with their peers" on the plains of Gaul and in the forests of Germany, was now satiated by gazing on criminals fighting for dear life with bears and tigers, or upon bands of gladiators who hacked each other to pieces on the encrimsoned sand.[1] The languid enervation of the delicate and dissolute aristocrat could only be amused by magnificence and stimulated by grossness or by blood.[2] Thus the gracious illusions by which true Art has ever aimed at purging the passions of terror and pity, were extinguished by the realism of tragedies ignobly horrible, and comedies intolerably base. Two phrases sum up the characteristics of Roman civilisation in the days of the Empire—heartless cruelty, and unfathomable corruption.[3]

If there had been a refuge anywhere for the sentiments of outraged virtue and outraged humanity, we might have hoped to find it in the Senate, the members of which were heirs of so many noble and austere traditions. But—even in the days of Tiberius—the Senate, as Tacitus tells us, had rushed headlong into the most servile flattery,[4] and this would not have been possible if its members had not been tainted by the prevalent deterioration. It was

[1] Suet. *Claud.* 14, 21, 34; *Ner.* 12; *Calig.* 35; Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 49; Plin. *Paneg.* 33.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 32.

[3] Eph. iv. 19; 2 Cor. vii. 10. Merivale, vi. 452; Champagny, *Les Césars*, iv. 161, *seq.* Seneca, describing the age in the tragedy of *Octavia*, says:—

"Saeculo premimur gravi
Quo scelera regnant, saevit impietas furens," etc.
—*Oct.* 379—437.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* iii. 65, vi. 2, xiv. 12, 13, etc.

before, the once grave and pure-minded Senators of Rome—the greatness of whose state was founded on the sanctity of family relationships—that the Censor Metellus had declared in A.U.C. 602, without one dissentient murmur, that marriage could only be regarded as an intolerable necessity.[1] Before that same Senate, at an earlier period, a leading Consular had not scrupled to assert that there was scarcely one among them all who had not ordered one or more of his own infant children to be exposed to death.[2] In the hearing of that same Senate in A.D. 59, not long before St. Paul wrote his letter to Philemon, C. Cassius Longinus had gravely argued that the only security for the life of masters was to put into execution the sanguinary Silanian Law, which enacted that, if a master was murdered, every one of his slaves, however numerous, however notoriously innocent, should be indiscriminately massacred.[3] It was the Senators of Rome who thronged forth to meet with adoring congratulations the miserable youth who came to them with his hands reeking with the blood of matricide.[4] They offered thanksgivings to the gods for his worst cruelties,[5] and obediently voted Divine honours

[1] Comp. Tac. *Ann.* ii. 37, 38, iii. 34, 35, xv. 19; Aul. Gell. *N. A.* i. 6; Liv. *Epit.* 59.

[2] This abandonment of children was a *normal* practice (Ter. *Heaut.* iv. 1, 37; Ovid, *Amor.* ii. 14; Suet. *Calig.* 5; *Oct.* 65; Juv. *Sat.* vi. 592; Plin. *Ep.* iv. 15 [comp. ii. 20]; Sen. *ad Marciam*, 19; *Controv.* x. 6). Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, iv. 11) tells us that there was a goddess *Levana*, so called "quia *levat* infantes;" if the father did not take the new-born child in his arms, it was exposed (Tac. *Hist.* v. 5; *Germ.* 19; Tert. *Apol.* 9; *Ad Natt.* 15; Minuc. Fel. *Octav.* xxx. 31; Stobaeu's *Floril.* lxxv. 15; Epictet. i. 23; Paulus, *Dig.* xxv. 3, etc. And see Denis, *Idées morales dans l'Antiquité*, ii. 203).

[3] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 43, 44; *v. supra*, p. 3.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 13: "festo cultu Senatum."

[5] "Quotiens fugas et caedes jussit princeps, totiens grates Deis actas." Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 64.

to the dead infant, four months old, of the wife whom he afterwards killed with a brutal kick.[1]

And what was the religion of a period which needed the sanctions and consolations of religion more deeply than any age since the world began? It is certain that the old Paganism was—except in country places—practically dead. The very fact that it was necessary to prop it up by the buttress of political interference shows how hollow and ruinous the structure of classic Polytheism had become.[2] The decrees and reforms of Claudius were not likely to reassure the faith of an age which had witnessed in contemptuous silence, or with frantic adulation, the assumption by Gaius of the attributes of deity after deity, had tolerated his insults against their sublimest objects of worship, and encouraged his claim to a living apotheosis.[3] The upper classes were "destitute of faith, yet terrified at scepticism." They had long learnt to treat the current mythology as a mass of worthless fables, scarcely amusing enough for even a schoolboy's laughter,[4] but they were the ready dupes of every wandering quack who chose to assume the character of a *mathematicus* or a *mage*.[5] Their official religion was a decrepit Theogony; their real religion was a vague and credulous fatalism, which disbelieved in the existence of the gods,

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 6; Suet. *Ner.* 25; Dion Cass. lxii. 27.

[2] Suet. *Tib.* 36.

[3] Suet. *Calig.* 51. See Mart. *Ep.* v. 8, where he talks of "the edict of our Lord and God," *i.e.*, of Domitian; and vii. 60, where he says that he shall pray to Domitian, and not to Jupiter.

[4] "Esse aliquos manes et subterranea regna . . .
Nec pueri credunt nisi qui nondum aere lavantur."
—Juv. *Sat.* ii. 149, 152.

[5] Tac. *H.* i. 22; *Ann.* vi. 20, 21, xii. 68; Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 248, iii. 42, vii. 200, etc.; Suet. *Aug.* 94; *Tib.* 14; *Ner.* 26; *Otho*, 4; *Domit.* 15, etc.

or held with Epicurus that they were careless of mankind.[1] The mass of the populace either accorded to the old beliefs a nominal adherence which saved them the trouble of giving any thought to the matter,[2] and reduced their creed and their morals to a survival of national habits; or else they plunged with eager curiosity into the crowd of foreign cults[3]—among which a distorted Judaism took its place[4]—such as made the Romans familiar with strange names like Sabazius and Anchialus, Agdistis, Isis, and the Syrian goddess.[5] All men joined in the confession that "the oracles were dumb." It hardly needed the wail of mingled lamentations as of departing deities which swept over the astonished crew of the vessel off Palodes to assure the world that the reign of the gods of Hellas was over —that "Great Pan was dead."[6]

Such are the scenes which we must witness, such are the sentiments with which we must become familiar, the moment that we turn away our eyes from the spectacle of the little Christian churches, composed chiefly as yet of slaves and artisans, who had been taught to imitate a Divine example of humility and sincerity, of purity and love.

[1] Lucr. vi. 445—455; Juv. *Sat.* vii. 189—202, x. 129, xiii. 86—89; Plin. *H. N.* ii. 21; Quinct. *Instt.* v. 6, § 3; Tac. *H.* i. 10—18, ii. 69—82; *Agric.* 13; *Germ.* 33; *Ann.* vi. 22, etc.

[2] Juv. *Sat.* iii. 144, vi. 342, xiii. 75—83.

[3] "Nec turba deorum talis ut est hodie," Juv. *Sat.* xiii. 46; "Ignobilem Deorum turbam quam longo aevo longa superstitio congessit," Sen. *Ep.* 110. See Boissier, *Les Religions Etrangères* (*Rel. Rom.* i. 374—450); Liv. xxxix. 8; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; Val. Max. I. iii. 2.

[4] Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 96—106; Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 3; Pers. *Sat.* v. 180.

[5] Cic. *De Legg.* ii. 8; *De Div.* ii. 24; Tert. *ad Natt.* i. 10; Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 263, xv. 1—32.

[6] Plut. *De Def. Orac.*, p. 419. Some Christian writers connect this remarkable story with the date of the Crucifixion. See Niedner, *Lehrbuch d. Chr. K. G.*, p. 64.

There were, indeed, a few among the Heathen who lived nobler lives and professed a purer ideal than the Pagans around them. Here and there in the ranks of the philosophers a Demetrius, a Musonius Rufus, an Epictetus; here and there among Senators an Helvidius Priscus, a Paetus Thrasea, a Barea Soranus; here and there among literary men a Seneca or a Persius—showed that virtue was not yet extinct. But the Stoicism on which they leaned for support amid the terrors and temptations of that awful epoch utterly failed to provide a remedy against the universal degradation. It aimed at cherishing an insensibility which gave no real comfort, and for which it offered no adequate motive. It aimed at repressing the passions by a violence so unnatural that with them it also crushed some of the gentlest and most elevating emotions. Its self-satisfaction and exclusiveness repelled the gentlest and sweetest natures from its communion. It made a vice of compassion, which Christianity inculcated as a virtue; it cherished a haughtiness which Christianity discouraged as a sin. It was unfit for the task of ameliorating mankind, because it looked on human nature in its normal aspects with contemptuous disgust. Its marked characteristic was a despairing sadness, which became specially prominent in its most sincere adherents. Its favourite theme was the glorification of suicide, which wiser moralists had severely reprobated,[1] but which many Stoics belauded as the one sure refuge against oppression and outrage.[2] It was a philosophy which was indeed able to lacerate the heart with a righteous indignation against

[1] Virg. *Æn.* vi. 450, *seq.*; *Tusc. Disp.* i. 74; Cic. *De Senect.* 73; *De Rep.* vi. 15; *Somn. Scip.* 3; Sen. *Ep.* 70. Comp. Epict. *Enchir.* 52.

[2] Both Zeno and Cleanthes died by suicide. For the frequency of

the crimes and follies of mankind, but which vainly strove to resist, and which scarcely even hoped to stem, the ever-swelling tide of vice and misery. For wretchedness it had no pity; on vice it looked with impotent disdain. Thrasea was regarded as an antique hero for walking out of the Senate-house during the discussion of some decree which involved a servility more than usually revolting.[1] He gradually drove his few admirers to the conviction that, even for those who had every advantage of rank and wealth, nothing was possible but a life of crushing sorrow ended by a death of complete despair.[2] St. Paul and St. Peter, on the other hand, were at the very same epoch teaching in the same city, to a few Jewish hucksters and a few Gentile slaves, a doctrine so full of hope and brightness that letters, written in a prison with torture and death in view, read like idylls of serene happiness and pæans of triumphant joy. The graves of these poor sufferers, hid from the public eye in the catacombs, were decorated with an art, rude indeed, yet so triumphant as to make

suicide under the Empire see Tac. *Ann.* vi. 10, 26, xv. 60; *Hist.* v. 26; Suet. *Tib.* 49; Sen. *De Benef.* ii. 27; *Ep.* 70; Plin. *Ep.* i. 12, iii. 7, 16, vi. 24. For its glorification, Lucan, *Phars.* iv.:—

> "Mors utinam pavidos vitae subducere nolles,
> Sed virtus te sola daret."

"Mortes repentinae, hoc est summa vitae felicitas," Plin. *H. N.* vii. 53, cf. 51. The practice of suicide became in the days of Trajan almost a "national usage" (see Merivale, vii. 317, viii. 107). The variety of Latin phrases for suicide shows the frequency of the crime. On the pride of Stoicism see Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 57; Juv. xiii. 93.

[1] On the motion against the memory of Agrippina (Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 12). He had also opposed the execution of Antistius (*id.* xiv. 48). It was further remembered against him that he had not attended the obsequies of the deified Poppæa, or offered sacrifice for the preservation of Nero's "divine voice."

[2] Suet. *Ner.* 37.

their subterranean squalor radiant with emblems of all that is brightest and most poetic in the happiness of man.[1] While the glimmering taper of the Stoics was burning pale, as though amid the vapours of a charnel-house, the torch of Life upheld by the hands of the Tarsian tent-maker and the Galilæan fisherman had flashed from Damascus to Antioch, from Antioch to Athens, from Athens to Corinth, from Corinth to Ephesus, from Ephesus to Rome.

[1] "There the ever-green leaf protests in sculptured silence that the winter of the grave cannot touch the saintly soul; the blossoming branch speaks of vernal suns beyond the snows of this chill world; the good shepherd shows from his benign looks that the mortal way so terrible to nature had become to those Christians as the meadow-path between the grassy slopes and beside the still waters." (Martineau, *Hours of Thought*, p. 155.)

STATE CENTRAL LIBRARY
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
KERALA

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE OF THE ANTICHRIST.

"Hic hostis Deum
Hominumque templis expulit superos suis,
Civesque patria; spiritum fratri abstulit
Hausit cruorem matris;—et lucem videt!"
—SEN. *Octav.* 239.

"Praestare Neronem
Securum valet haec aetas."
—JUV. *Sat.* viii. 173.

ALL the vice, all the splendour, all the degradation of Pagan Rome seemed to be gathered up in the person of that Emperor who first placed himself in a relation of direct antagonism against Christianity. Long before death ended the astute comedy in which Augustus had so gravely borne his part,[1] he had experienced the Nemesis of Absolutism, and foreseen the awful possibilities which it involved. But neither he, nor any one else, could have divined that four such rulers as Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero—the first a sanguinary tyrant, the second a furious madman, the third an uxorious imbecile, the fourth a heartless buffoon—would in succession afflict and horrify the world. Yet these rulers sat upon the breast of Rome with the paralysing spell of a nightmare. The concentration of the old prerogatives of many offices in the

[1] On his death-bed he asked his friends "whether he had fitly gone through the play of life," and, if so, begged for their applause like an actor on the point of leaving the stage (Suet. *Octav.* 99).

person of one who was at once Consul, Censor, Tribune, Pontifex Maximus, and perpetual Imperator, fortified their power with the semblance of legality, and that power was rendered terrible by the sword of the Prætorians, and the deadly whisper of the informers. No wonder that Christians saw the true type of the Antichrist in that omnipotence of evil, that apotheosis of self, that disdain for humanity, that hatred against all mankind besides, that gigantic aspiration after the impossible, that frantic blasphemy and unlimited indulgence, which marked the despotism of a Gaius or a Nero. The very fact that their power was precarious as well as gigantic—that the lord of the world might at any moment be cut off by the indignation of the *canaille* of Rome, nay, more, by the revenge of a single tribune, or the dagger-thrust of a single slave[1]—did but make more striking the resemblance which they displayed to the gilded monster of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Their autocracy, like that visionary idol, was an image of gold on feet of clay. Of that colossus many a Christian would doubtless be reminded when he saw the huge statue of Nero, with the radiated head and the attributes of the sun-god, which once towered 120 feet high on the shattered pediment still visible beside the ruins of the Flavian Amphitheatre.[2]

The sketch which I am now presenting to the reader is the necessary introduction to the annals of that closing epoch of the first century, which witnessed the early struggle of Christianity with the Pagan power. In the thirteen years of Nero's reign all the worst elements

[1] Out of 43 persons in Lipsius's *Stemma Caesarum*, 32 died violent deaths, *i.e.*, nearly 75 per cent.

[2] Suet. *Ner.* 31; Mart. *Spect. Ep.* 2.

of life which had long mingled with the sap of ancient civilisation seem to have rushed at once into their scarlet flower. To the Christians of that epoch the dominance of such an Emperor presented itself in the aspect of wickedness raised to superhuman exaltation, and engaged in an impious struggle against the Lord and against His saints.

Till the days of Nero the Christians had never been brought into collision with the Imperial Government. We may set aside as a worthless fiction the story that Tiberius had been so much interested in the account of the Crucifixion forwarded to him by Pontius Pilate, as to consult the Senate on the advisability of admitting Jesus among the gods of the Pantheon.[1] It is very unlikely that Tiberius ever heard of the existence of the Christians. In its early days the Faith was too humble to excite any notice out of the limits of Palestine. Gaius, absorbed in his mad attempt to set up in the Holy of Holies "a desolating abomination," in the form of a huge image of himself, entertained a savage hatred of the Jews, but had not learned to discriminate between them and Christians. Claudius, disturbed by tumults in the Ghetto of Jewish freedmen across the Tiber, had been taught to look with alarm and suspicion on the name of Christus distorted into "Chrestus;" but his decree for the expulsion of the Jews from Rome, which had been a dead letter from the first, only affected Christianity by causing the providential migration of Prisca and Aquila, to become at Corinth and Ephesus

[1] Ps. Clem. *Hom.* i. 6; Tert. *Apol.* 5; Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 2; Jer. *Chron. Pasch.* i. 430. Braun (*De Tiberii Christum in Deorum numerum referendi consilio.* Bonn, 1834) vainly tried to support this fable. Tiberius, more than any Emperor, was "circa Deos et religiones negligentior" (Suet. *Tib.* 69).

C 2

the hosts, the partners, and the protectors of St. Paul.[1] Nero was destined to enter into far deadlier and closer relations with the nascent Faith, and to fill so vast a space in the horrified imaginations of the early Christians as to become by his cruelties, his blasphemies, his enormous crimes, the nearest approach which the world has yet seen to the "Man of Sin." He was the ideal of depravity and wickedness, standing over against the ideal of all that is sinless and Divine. Against the Christ was now to be ranged the Antichrist,—the man-god of Pagan adulation, in whom was manifested the consummated outcome of Heathen crime and Heathen power.

Up to the tenth year of Nero's reign the Christians had many reasons to be grateful to the power of the Roman Empire. St. Paul, when he wrote from Corinth to the Thessalonians, had indeed seen in the fabric of Roman polity, and in Claudius, its reigning representative, the "check" and the "checker" which must be removed before the coming of the Lord.[2] Yet during his stormy life the Apostle had been shielded by the laws of Rome in more than one provincial tumult. The Roman politarchs of Thessalonica had treated him with humanity. He had been protected from the infuriated Jews in Corinth by the disdainful justice of Gallio. In Jerusalem the prompt interference of Lysias and of Festus had sheltered him from the plots of the Sanhedrin. At Cæsarea he had appealed to Cæsar as his best security from the persistent hatred of Ananias and the Sadducees. If we have taken a correct view of the latter part of his career,

[1] See Tert. *Apol.* 3; *ad Natt.* i. 3; my *Life and Work of St. Paul,* i. 559. I cannot accept the view of Herzog (*Real-Encykl., s.v.* Claudius), that *Chrestus* was some seditious Roman Jew.

[2] *Life and Work of St. Paul,* i. 584, fg.

his appeal had not been in vain, and he owed the last two years of his missionary activity to the impartiality of Roman Law. Hence, apart from the general principle of submission to recognised authority, he had special reason to urge the Roman Christians "to be subject to the higher powers," and to recognise in them the ordinance of God.[1] With the private wickednesses of rulers the Christians were not directly concerned. Rumours, indeed, they must have heard of the poisoning of Claudius and of Britannicus; of Nero's intrigues with Acte; of his friendship with the bad Otho; of the divorce and legal assassination of Octavia; of the murders of Agrippina and Poppæa, of Burrus and Seneca. Other rumours must have reached them of nameless orgies, of which it was a shame even to speak. But knowing how the whole air of the bad society around them reeked with lies, they may have shown the charity that hopeth all things, and imputeth no evil, and rejoiceth not in iniquity, by tacitly setting aside these stories as incredible or false. It was not till A.D. 64, when Nero had been nearly ten years on the throne, that the slow light of History fully revealed to the Church of Christ what this more than monster was.

A dark spirit was walking in the house of the Cæsars—a spirit of lust and blood which destroyed every family in succession with which they were allied. The Octavii, the Claudii, the Domitii, the Silani, were all hurled into ruin or disgrace in their attempt to scale, by intermarriage with the deified race of Julius, "the dread summits of Cæsarean power." It has been well said that no page even of Tacitus has so sombre and tragic an eloquence as the mere *Stemma Caesarum*. The great

[1] Rom. xiii. 1—7.

Julius, robbed by death of his two daughters, was succeeded by his nephew Augustus,[1] who, in ordering the assassination of Cæsarion, the natural son of Julius by Cleopatra, extinguished the direct line of the greatest of the Cæsars. Augustus by his three marriages was the father of but one daughter, and that daughter disgraced his family and embittered his life. He saw his two elder grandsons die under circumstances of the deepest suspicion; and being induced to disinherit the third for the asserted stupidity and ferocity of his disposition, was succeeded by Tiberius, who was only his stepson, and had not a drop of the Julian blood in his veins. Tiberius had but one son, who was poisoned by his favourite, Sejanus, before his own death. This son, Drusus, left but one son, who was compelled to commit suicide by his cousin, Gaius; and one daughter, whose son, Rubellius Plautus, was put to death by order of Nero. The marriage of Germanicus, the nephew of Tiberius, with the elder Agrippina, grand-daughter of Augustus, seemed to open new hopes to the Roman people and the imperial house. Germanicus was a prince of courage, virtue, and ability, and the elder Agrippina was one of the purest and noblest women of her day. Of the nine children of this virtuous union six alone survived. On the parents, and the three sons in succession, the hopes of Rome were fixed. But Germanicus was poisoned by order of Tiberius, and

[1] It is characteristic of the manners of the age that Julius Cæsar had married four times, Augustus thrice, Tiberius twice, Gaius thrice, Claudius six times, and Nero thrice. Yet Nero was the last of the Cæsars, even of the adoptive line. No descendants had survived of the offspring of so many unions, and, as Merivale says, "a large proportion, which it would be tedious to calculate, were the victims of domestic jealousy and politic assassination" (*Hist.* vi. 366).

Agrippina was murdered in banishment after the endurance of the most terrible anguish. Their two elder sons, Nero and Drusus, lived only long enough to disgrace themselves, and to be forced to die of starvation.[1] The third was the monster Gaius. Of the three daughters, the youngest, Julia Livia, was put to death by the orders of Messalina, the wife of her uncle Claudius. Drusilla died in prosperous infamy, and Agrippina the younger, after a life of crime so abnormal and so detestable that it throws into the shade even the monstrous crimes of many of her contemporaries, murdered her husband, and was murdered by the orders of the son for whose sake she had waded through seas of blood.

That son was Nero! Truly the Palace of the Cæsars must have been haunted by many a restless ghost, and amid its vast and solitary chambers the guilty lords of its splendour must have feared lest they should come upon some spectre weeping tears of blood. In yonder corridor the floor was still stained with the life-blood of the murdered Gaius;[2] in that subterranean prison the miserable Drusus, cursing the name of his great-uncle Tiberius, tried to assuage the pangs of hunger by chewing the stuffing of his mattress;[3] in that gilded saloon Nero had his private interviews with the poison-mixer, Locusta, whom he salaried among "the instruments of his government;"[4]

[1] Tac. *Ann.* v. 3, vi. 24.

[2] "The Verres of a single province sank before the majesty of the law, and the righteous eloquence of his accuser; against the Verres of the world there was no defence except in the dagger of the assassin" (Freeman, *Essays*, ii. 330).

[3] Tac. *Ann.* vii. 23.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* xii. 66, xiii. 5.

in that splendid hall Britannicus fell into convulsions after tasting his brother's poisoned draught; that chamber, bright with the immoral frescoes of Arellius, witnessed the brutal kick which caused the death of the beautiful Poppæa. Fit palace for the Antichrist—fit temple for the wicked human god!—a temple which reeked with the memory of infamies—a palace which echoed with the ghostly footfall of murdered men!

Agrippina the Second, mother of Nero, was the Lady Macbeth of that scene of murder, but a Lady Macbeth with a life of worse stains and a heart of harder steel. Born at Cologne in the fourteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, she lost her father, Germanicus, by poison when she was three years old, and her mother, Agrippina, first by exile when she was twelve years old, and finally by murder when she was seventeen. She grew up with her wicked sisters and her wicked brother Gaius in the house of her grandmother Antonia, the widow of the elder Drusus. She was little more than fourteen years old when Tiberius married her to Cnæus Domitius Ahenobarbus. The Domitii were one of the noblest and most ancient families of Rome, but from the time that they first emerged into the light of history they had been badly pre-eminent for the ferocity of their dispositions. They derived the surname of Ahenobarbus, or brazen-beard, from a legend of their race intended to account for their physical peculiarity.[1] Six generations earlier, the orator Crassus had said of the Domitius Ahenobarbus of that day, "that it was no wonder his beard was of brass, since his mouth was of iron and his heart of lead." But though the traditions of cruelty and treachery had been carried on from gene-

[1] Suet. *Ner.* 1; Plut. *Æmil.* 25.

ration to generation,[1] they seemed to have culminated in the father of Nero, who added a tinge of meanness and vulgarity to the brutal manners of his race. His loose morals had been shocking even to a loose age, and men told each other in disgust how he had cheated in his prætorship; how he had killed one of his freedmen only because he had refused to drink as much as he was bidden; how he had purposely driven over a poor boy on the Appian Road; how in a squabble in the Forum he had struck out the eye of a Roman knight; how he had been finally banished for crimes still more shameful. It was a current anecdote of this man, who was "detestable through every period of his life," that when, nine years after his marriage, the birth of his son Nero was announced to him, he answered the congratulations of his friends with the remark, that from himself and Agrippina nothing could have been born but what was hateful, and for the public ruin.

Agrippina was twenty-one when her brother Gaius succeeded to the throne. Towards the close of his reign she was involved in the conspiracy of Lepidus, and was banished to the dreary island of Pontia. Gaius seized the entire property both of Domitius and of Agrippina. Nero, their little child, then three years old, was handed over as a penniless orphan to the charge of his aunt Domitia, the mother of Messalina. This lady entrusted the education of the child to two slaves, whose influence is perhaps traceable for many

[1] "The grandfather of Nero had been checked by Augustus from the bloodshed of his gladiatorial shows . . . his great-grandfather, 'the best of his race,' had changed sides three times, not without disgrace, in the civil wars . . . his great-great-grandfather had rendered himself infamous by cruelty and treachery at Pharsalia, and was also charged with most un-Roman pusillanimity" (see Suet. *Ner.* 1—5; Merivale, vi. 62, *seq*).

subsequent years. One of them was a barber, the other a dancer.

On the accession of Claudius, Agrippina was restored to her rank and fortune, and once more undertook the management of her child. He was, as we see from his early busts, a child of exquisite beauty. His beauty made him an object of special pride to his mother. From this time forward it seems to have been her one desire to elevate the boy to the rank of Emperor. In vain did the astrologers warn her that his elevation involved her murder. To such dark hints of the future she had but one reply—*Occidat dum imperet!* "Let him slay me, so he do but reign!"

By her second marriage, with Crispus Passienus, she further increased her already enormous wealth. She bided her time. Claudius was under the control of his freedmen, Narcissus and Pallas, and of the Empress Messalina, who had borne him two children, Britannicus and Octavia. The fierce and watchful jealousy of Messalina was soon successful in securing the banishment and subsequent murder of Julia, the younger sister of Agrippina,[1] and in spite of the retirement in which the latter strove to withdraw herself from the furious suspicion of the Empress, she felt that her own life and that of her son were in perpetual danger. A story prevailed that when Britannicus, then about seven years old, and Nero, who was little more than three years older,[2] had ridden side by side in the Trojan equestrian game, the favour of the populace towards the latter had been so openly manifested that Messalina had despatched emissaries to strangle him in bed, and

[1] Suet. *Claud.* 29.

[2] Tacitus says two years; but see Merivale, v. 517, vi. 88.

that they had been frightened from doing so by seeing a snake glide from under the pillow.[1] Meanwhile, Messalina was diverted from her purpose by the criminal pursuits which were notorious to every Roman with the single exception of her husband. She was falling deeper and deeper into that dementation preceding doom which at last enabled her enemy Narcissus to head a palace conspiracy and to strike her to the dust. Agrippina owed her escape from a fate similar to that of her younger sister solely to the infatuated passion of the rival whose name through all succeeding ages has been a byword of guilt and shame.

But now that Claudius was a widower, the fact that he was her uncle, and that unions between an uncle and niece were regarded as incestuous, did not prevent Agrippina from plunging into the intrigues by which she hoped to secure the Emperor for her third husband. Aided by the freedman Pallas, brother of Felix, the Procurator of Judæa, and by the blandishments which her near relationship to Claudius enabled her to exercise, she succeeded in achieving the second great object of her ambition. The twice-widowed matron became the sixth wife of the imbecile Emperor within three months of the execution of her predecessor. She had now but one further design to accomplish, and that was to gain the purple for the son whom she loved with all the tigress affection of her evil nature. She had been the sister and the wife, she wished also to be the mother of an Emperor.

The story of her daring schemes, her reckless cruelty,

[1] Suetonius thinks that the story rose from a snake's skin which his mother gave him as an amulet, and which for some time he wore in a bracelet (*Ner.* 6).

her incessant intrigues, is recorded in the stern pages of Tacitus. During the five years of her married life,[1] it is probable that no day passed without her thoughts brooding upon the guilty end which she had kept steadily in view during so many vicissitudes. Her first plan was to secure for Nero the hand of Octavia, the only daughter of Claudius. Octavia had long been betrothed to the young and noble Lucius Junius Silanus, a great-great-grandson of Augustus, who might well be dreaded as a strong protector of the rights of his young brother-in-law, Britannicus. As a favourite of the Emperor, and the betrothed of the Emperor's daughter, Silanus had already received splendid honours at the hands of the Senate, but at one blow Agrippina hurled him into the depths of shame and misery. The infamous Vitellius—Vitellius who had once begged as a favour a slipper of Messalina, and carried it in his bosom and kissed it with profound reverence—Vitellius who had placed a gilded image of the freedman Pallas among his household gods—trumped up a false charge against Silanus, and, as Censor, struck his name off the list of the Senate. His betrothal annulled, his prætorship abrogated, the high-spirited young man, recognising whose hand it was that had aimed this poisoned arrow at his happiness, waited till Agrippina's wedding-day, and on that day committed suicide on the altar of his own Penates. The next step of the Empress was to have her rival Lollia Paulina charged with magic, to secure her banishment, to send a tribune to kill her, and to identify, by personal inspection, her decapitated head. Then Calpurnia was driven from Rome because Claudius, with perfect inno-

[1] She was married in A.D. 49, and poisoned her husband in October, A.D. 54.

cence, had praised her beauty. On the other hand, Seneca was recalled from his Corsican exile, in order to increase Agrippina's popularity by an act of ostensible mercy, which restored to Rome its favourite writer, while it secured a powerful adherent for her cause and an eminent tutor for her son. The next step was to effect the betrothal of Octavia to Nero, who was twelve years old. A still more difficult and important measure was to secure his adoption. Claudius was attached to his son Britannicus, and, in spite of his extraordinary fatuity, he could hardly fail to see that his son's rights would be injured by the adoption of an elder boy of most noble birth, who reckoned amongst his supporters all those who might have natural cause to dread the vengeance of a son of Messalina. Claudius was an antiquary, and he knew that for 800 years, from the days of Attus Clausus downwards, there had never been an adoption among the patrician Claudii. In vain did Agrippina and her adherents endeavour to poison his mind by whispered insinuations about the parentage of Britannicus. But he was at last overborne, rather than convinced, by the persistence with which Agrippina had taken care that the adoption should be pressed upon him in the Senate, by the multitude, and even in the privacy of his own garden. Pallas, too, helped to decide his wavering determination by quoting the precedents of the adoption of Tiberius by Augustus, and of Gaius by Tiberius. Had he but well weighed the fatal significance of those precedents, he would have hesitated still longer ere he sacrificed to an intriguing alien the birthright, the happiness, and ultimately the lives of the young son and daughter whom he so dearly loved.

And now Agrippina's prosperous wickedness was

bearing her along full sail to the fatal haven of her ambition. She obtained the title of Augusta, which even the stately wife of Augustus had never borne during her husband's lifetime. Seated on a lofty throne by her husband's side, she received foreign embassies and senatorial deputations. She gained permission to antedate the majority of her son, and secured for him a promise of the Consulship, admission to various priesthoods, a proconsular *imperium*, and the title of "Prince of the Youth." She made these honours the pretext for obtaining a largess to the soldiery, and Circensian games for the populace, and at these games Nero appeared in the manly toga and triumphal insignia, while Britannicus, utterly eclipsed, stood humbly by his side in the boyish *praetexta*—the embroidered robe which marked his youth. And while step after step was taken to bring Nero into splendid prominence, Britannicus was kept in such deep seclusion, and watched with such jealous eyes, that the people hardly knew whether he was alive or dead. In vain did Agrippina lavish upon the unhappy lad her false caresses. Being a boy of exceptional intelligence, he saw through her hypocrisy, and did not try to conceal the contemptuous disgust which her arts inspired. Meanwhile he was a prisoner in all but name: every expedient was invented to keep him at the greatest distance from his father; every friend who loved him, every freedman who was faithful to him, every soldier who seemed likely to embrace his cause, was either secretly undermined, or removed under pretext of honourable promotion. Tutored as he was by adversity to conceal his feelings, he one day through accident or boyish passion returned the salutation of

his adoptive brother by the name of Ahenobarbus, instead of calling him by the name Nero, which was the mark of his new rank as the adopted son of Claudius. Thereupon the rage of Agrippina and Nero knew no bounds; and such insolence—for in this light the momentary act of carelessness or venial outburst of temper was represented to Claudius—made the boy a still more defenceless victim to the machinations of his stepmother. Month after month she wove around him the web of her intrigues. The Prætorians were won over by flattery, gifts, and promises. The double præfecture of Lucius Geta and Rufius Crispinus was superseded by the appointment of Afranius Burrus, an honest soldier, but a partisan of the Empress, to whom he thus owed his promotion to the most coveted position in the Roman army. From the all-powerful freedmen of Claudius, Agrippina had little to fear. Callistus was dead, and she played off against each other the rival influences of Pallas and Narcissus. Pallas was her devoted adherent and paramour; Narcissus was afraid to move in opposition to her, because the accession of Britannicus would have been his own certain death-warrant, since he had been the chief agent in the overthrow of Messalina.

As for the phenomena on which the populace looked with terror—the fact that the skies had seemed to blaze with fire on the day of Nero's adoption, and violent shocks of earthquake had shaken Rome on the day that he assumed the manly toga—Agrippina cared nothing for them. She would recognise no omen which did not promise success to her determination. Nothing could now divert her from her purpose. When Domitia, the aunt under whose roof the young Nero had been trained,

began to win his smiles by the contrast between her flatteries and presents and the domineering threats of his mother, Agrippina at once brought against her a charge of magic, and, in spite of the opposition of Narcissus, Domitia was condemned to death. The Empress hesitated at no crime which helped to pave the way of her son to power, but at the same time her ambition was so far selfish that she intended to keep that son under her own exclusive influence.

Many warnings now showed her that the time was ripe for her supreme endeavour. Her quarrel with Narcissus had broken out into threats and recriminations in the very presence of the Emperor. The Senate showed signs of indignant recalcitrance against her attacks on those whose power she feared, or whose wealth she envied. Her designs were now so transparent, that Narcissus began openly to show his compassion for the hapless and almost deserted Britannicus. But, worst of all, it was clear that Claudius himself was becoming conscious of his perilous mistake, and was growing weary both of her and of her son. He had changed his former wife for a worse. If Messalina had been unfaithful to him, so he began to suspect was Agrippina, and he could not but feel that she had changed her old fawning caresses for a threatening insolence. He was sick of her ambition, of her intrigues, of the hatred she always displayed to his oldest and most faithful servants, of her pushing eagerness for her Nero, of her treacherous cruelty towards his own children. He was heard to drop ominous expressions. He began to display towards Britannicus a yearning affection, full of the passionate hope that when he was a little older his wrongs would be avenged. All this Agrippina learnt from her spies.

Not a day was to be lost. Narcissus, whose presence was the chief security for his master's life, had gone to the baths of Sinuessa to find relief from a fit of the gout. There lay at this time in prison, on a charge of poisoning, a woman named Locusta, whose career recalls the Mrs. Turner of the reign of James I., and the Marchioness de Brinvilliers of the court of Louis XIV. To this woman Agrippina repaired with the promise of freedom and reward, if she would provide a poison which would disturb the brain without too rapidly destroying life. Halotus, the Emperor's *praegustator*, or taster, and Xenophon, his physician, had been already won over to share in the deed. The poison was infused into a fine and delicious mushroom of a kind of which Claudius was known to be particularly fond, and Agrippina gave this mushroom to her husband with her own hand. After tasting it he became very quiet, and then called for wine. He was carried off to bed senseless, but the quantity of wine which he had drunk weakened the effects of the poison, and at a sign from Agrippina the faithless physician finished the murder by tickling the throat of the sufferer with a poisoned feather. Before the morning of Oct. 13, A.D. 54, Claudius was dead.

His death was concealed from the public and from his children, whom Agrippina with hypocritical caresses and false tears kept by her side in her own chamber, until everything was ready for the proclamation of Nero. At noon, which the Chaldæans had declared would be the only lucky hour of an unlucky day, the gates of the palace were thrown open, and Nero walked forth with Afranius Burrus by his side. The Prætorian Præfect informed the guard that Claudius had appointed

Nero his successor. A few faithful voices asked, "Where is Britannicus?" But as no one answered, and the young prince was not forthcoming, they accepted what seemed to be an accomplished fact. Nero went to the Prætorian camp, promised a donation of 15,000 sesterces (more than £130) to each soldier, and was proclaimed Emperor. The Senate accepted the initiative of the Prætorians, and by sunset Nero was securely seated on the throne of the Roman world. The dream of Agrippina's life was accomplished. She was now the mother, as she had been the sister and the wife of an Emperor; and that young Emperor, when the tribune came to ask him the watchword for the night, answered in the words—*Optimae Matri!* "To the Best of Mothers!"

CHAPTER III.

THE FEATURES OF THE ANTICHRIST.

Ἔσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν μητροκτόνος ἡγεμονεύσει.—Orac. Sib. *ap.* Xiphilin. lxii. p. 709.

"Nero . . . ut erat exsecrabilis ac nocens tyrannus, prosilivit ad excidendum coeleste templum delendamque justitiam."—Lactant. *De Mort. Persec.* 2.

"Quid Nerone pejus?"—Mart. *Epig.* vii. 34.

FROM the very moment of her success, the awful Nemesis began to fall upon Agrippina, as it falls on all sinners—that worst Nemesis, which breaks crowned with fire out of the achievement of guilty purposes. Of Agrippina on the night of Claudius's murder it might doubtless have been said, as has been said of another queen on the tragic night on which her husband perished in the explosion at Kirk o' Fields, that she "retired to rest—to sleep, doubtless—sleep with the soft tranquillity of an innocent child. Remorse may disturb the slumbers of the man who is dabbling with his first experiences of wrong. When the pleasure has been tasted and is gone, and nothing is left of the crime but the ruin it has wrought, then, too, the Furies take their seats upon the midnight pillow. But the meridian of evil is for the most part left unvexed; and when human creatures have chosen their road, they are left alone to follow it to the end."[1]

From the day that she had won her own heart's

[1] Froude, *Hist.* vii. 511.

desires, Agrippina found that her hopes had vanished, and that her life was to be plunged in retributive calamities. She found that crime ever needs the support of further crime; that the evil spirits who serve the government of an abandoned heart demand incessant sacrifices at their altar. She had brought about the ruin of the young Lucius Junius Silanus. His elder brother, Marcus, was a man of such a gentle and unassuming character that Gaius had nicknamed him "the Golden Sheep;" and though the blood of the imperial family flowed in his veins, he excited so little jealousy that he had been raised to the consulship, and even sent to Asia with proconsular command. Yet Agrippina dreaded that he might avenge the death of his brother, and, without the knowledge of Nero, sent the freedman Helius, with P. Celer, a Roman knight, who poisoned Silanus at a banquet, so openly that the whole world was aware of what had been done.

The aged Narcissus was her next victim; and more murders would have followed had not Burrus and Seneca taken measures to prevent them. Their influence was happily sufficient, since they were still regarded as tutors of the young Cæsar, who was only seventeen years old. They also endeavoured to veil, and as far as possible to cloak, the audacious intrusions into state affairs, which showed that Agrippina was not content with the exceptional honours showered upon her. Of those honours, strange to say, one of the chief was her appointment to be a priestess of the now deified Emperor whom she had so recently poisoned! It is clear that, though she had again and again proved herself to be the most ungrateful of women, she expected from her son a boundless gratitude. Indeed, she so galled

the vanity and terrified the cowardice of his small and mean nature by her constant threats and upbraidings, that he feared her far more than he had ever loved. The consequence was that she had at once to struggle for her ascendancy. It was threatened on the one hand by the influence of Burrus and Seneca, and on the other by the blandishments of bad companions and fawning slaves. Bent on pleasure, fond of petty accomplishments, flattered into the notion that he was a man of consummate artistic taste, Nero occupied himself with *dilettante* efforts in sculpture, painting, singing, verse-making, and chariot-driving, and was quite content to leave to his tutors the graver affairs of state. His tiger nature had not yet tasted blood. Seneca in his treatise on clemency, written at the close of Nero's first year, had informed the delighted world that the gentle youth, on being required to sign the order for a criminal's execution, had expressed the fervent wish that he had never learnt to write. Seneca also composed for him the admired speeches which he was now and then called upon to deliver. The government of the world was practically in the hands of an upright soldier and an able philosopher; and however glaring were the inconsistencies of the latter, he had yet attained to a moral standard incomparably superior to that professed by the majority of his contemporaries. If the political machine worked with perfect smoothness, if Rome for five years was shocked by no public atrocities, if informers to some extent found their occupation gone, if no noble blood was wantonly shed, if the Senate was respected and the soldiers were orderly, the glory of that "golden quinquennium"—which, in the opinion of Trajan, eclipsed

the merits of even the worthiest princes—was due, not to the small-minded and would-be æsthetic youth who figured as Emperor, but to the tutors who kept in check the wild passions of his mother, and directed the acts which ostensibly proceeded from himself.

But in order to keep him amused, they thought it either inexpedient or impossible to maintain too strict a discipline over his moral character. Nero was nominally married to the daughter of Claudius, but from the first, they were separated from each other, by a mutual and instinctive repulsion. When he entered into an intrigue with Acte, a beautiful Greek freedwoman, his tutors held it desirable to connive at vices which the spirit of the age scarcely pretended to condemn. Agrippina, however, treated him as though he were still a child, and, when she observed his resentment, forfeited all his confidence by passing from the extreme of furious reproach to the extreme of fulsome complaisance. Hence, alike in affairs of state and in his domestic pleasures he was alienated from his mother, and in his daily life he fell unreservedly under the influence of corrupt associates like Marcus Otho and Claudius Senecio, two bad specimens of the *jeunesse dorée* of their day, the dandies of an age when dandyism was a far viler thing than it is in modern times.[1] At last the quarrel between Nero and Agrippina became so fierce that she did not hesitate to reveal to him all the crimes which she had committed for his sake, and if she could not retain her sway over his mind by gratitude, she terrified him with threats that she who had raised him to the throne could hurl him from it. Britannicus was the true heir; Nero, but for her, would have re-

[1] Niebuhr.

named a mere Ahenobarbus. She was the daughter of Germanicus; she would go in person to the Prætorian camp, with Britannicus by her side, and then let the maimed Burrus and the pedagogic Seneca see whether they could prevent her from restoring to the throne of his fathers the injured boy who had been ousted by her intrigues on behalf of an adopted alien. "I made you Emperor, I can unmake you. Britannicus is the true Emperor, not you." She dinned such taunts and threats into the ears of a son who was already vitiated in character, who already began to feel his power, until he too was driven to protect, by the murder of a brother, the despotism which his mother had won for him by the murder of a husband. Thus in every way she became the evil angel of his destiny. She drove him into the crimes of which she had already set the fatal example. It was her fault if he rapidly lost sight of the lesson which Seneca had so assiduously inculcated, that the one impregnable bulwark of a monarch is the affection of his people.[1]

Nero began to look on the young Britannicus as King John looked on the young Arthur. Even civilised, even Christian ages have shown how perilous is the position of a hated heir to a usurped throne. The threats of Agrippina had deepened dislike into detestation, and uneasiness into terror. Britannicus was a fine, strong, well-grown boy, who showed signs of a vigorous character and a keen intellect. A little incident which occurred in December, A.D. 54, had alarmed Nero still further. The Saturnalia were being celebrated with their usual effusive joy, and at one of

[1] "Unum est inexpugnabile munimentum amor civium" (Sen. *De Clement.* i. 19, 5).

the feasts Nero—who had become by lot the *Rex bibendi*, or Master of the Revel—had issued his mimic commands to the other guests in a spirit of harmless fun; but in order to put the shyness of Britannicus to the blush, he had ordered the lad to go out into the middle of the room and sing a song. Without the least trepidation or awkwardness Britannicus had stepped out, and sung a magnificent fragment of a tragic chorus, in which he had indicated how he was expelled from all his rights by violence and crime. The scene would have been an awkward one under any circumstances; it was rendered still more so by the fact that in the darkening hall a deep murmur had expressed the admiration and sympathy of the guests. Yet no steps could be taken against a young prince whom it was impossible to put to death openly, and against whom there was no pretence for a criminal accusation.

But the first century, like the fifteenth, was an age of poisoners. Locusta was still in prison, and Nero employed the Prætorian tribune Julius Pollio to procure from her a poison which might effect a slow death. There was no need to win over the *praegustator*, or the personal attendants of the young prince. Care had long been taken that the poor boy should only be surrounded by the creatures of his enemies. The poison was administered, but it failed. Nero grew wild with alarm. Stories, which probably gained their darkest touches from the horror of his subsequent career, told how he had threatened the tribune and struck Locusta for her cowardice in not doing her work well, "as though *he*, forsooth, need have any fear about the Julian law." Deadlier poison was then concocted outside his own bed-chamber, and tried upon animals, until its effects

were found to be sufficiently rapid. Setting aside these stories as crude exaggerations, all authorities are agreed as to the circumstances of the death of Britannicus. It was a custom established by Augustus that the young princes of the imperial house should sit at dinner with nobles of their own age at a lower and less luxuriously served table than that at which the Emperor dined. While Britannicus was thus dining, a draught was handed to him which had been tasted by his *praegustator*, but was too hot to drink. He asked for water to cool it, and in that cold water the poison was administered. He drank, and instantly sunk down from his seat silent and breathless. The guests, among whom was the young Titus, the future Emperor of Rome, started from the table in consternation. The countenance of Agrippina, working with astonishment, anguish, and terror, showed that she at least had not been admitted into the terrible secret. Octavia looked on with the self-possession which in such a palace had taught her on all occasions to hide her emotions under a simulated apathy. The banqueters were disturbed until Nero, with perfect coolness, bade them resume their mirth and conversation. "Britannicus," he said, "will soon be well. He has only been seized with one of the epileptic fits to which he is liable." It was no epileptic fit—the last of the Claudii was dead. That night, amid storms which seemed to mark the wrath of Heaven, the corpse was carried with hurried privacy to a mean funeral pyre on the Field of Mars. We may disbelieve the ghastly story that the rain washed off the chalk which had been used to disguise the livid indications of poison; but it seems certain that the last rites were paid with haste

and meanness little suited to the last male descendant of a family which had been famous for so many centuries—to the sole inheritor of the glorious traditions of so many of the noblest lines.

The Romans acquiesced too easily in this terrible crime, because it fell in with the Machiavellian policy which would gladly rid itself of a source of future disturbances. But they were punished for their facile tolerance by the change which every year developed in the character of their Emperor. Agrippina felt that even-handed justice was indeed beginning to commend the ingredients of the poisoned chalice to her own lips. Her enemies began to see that their opportunity was come. Her prosperity was instantly swallowed up in the "chaos of hatreds" which she had aroused by her unscrupulous ambition. The coward conscience of the Emperor was worked upon by a plot, contrived by Silana and Domitia Lepida, which charged Agrippina with the intention of raising Rubellius Plautus to the throne. This plot she overbore by the force of her own passionate indignation. Scornfully ignoring the false evidence trumped up against her, she claimed an interview with her son, and instead of entering on her own defence, demanded and secured the death or exile of her enemies. But she had by this time been deprived of her body-guard, of her sentinels, of all public honours, even of her home in the palace. Her son rarely visited her, and then only among a number of centurions, and he always left her after a brief and chilling salutation. She was living deserted by her friends, and exposed to deliberate insults, in alarmed isolation amid the hatred of the populace. Worse dangers thickened around her. Nero became deeply enamoured of Poppæa Sabina, the

wife of his friend Otho, and one of the most cruel and cold-blooded intriguers amid the abandoned society of Roman matrons. Nero was deeply smitten with her infantile features, the soft complexion, which she preserved by daily bathing in warm asses'-milk, her assumed modesty, her genial conversation and sprightly wit. He was specially enchanted with the soft, abundant hair, the envy of Roman beauties, for which he invented the fantastic, and, to Roman writers, supremely ludicrous epithet of "amber tresses." If Otho was one of the worst corrupters of Nero's character, he was punished by the loss of his wife, and Nero was punished by forming a connexion with a woman who instigated him to yet more frightful enormities. Up to this time his crimes had been mainly confined to the interior of the palace, and his follies had taken no worse form than safe and cowardly outrages on defenceless passengers in the streets at night, after the fashion of the Mohawks of the days of Queen Anne. But from the day that he first saw Poppæa a headlong deterioration is traceable in his character. She established a complete influence over him, and drove him by her taunts and allurements to that crime which, even among his many enormities, is the most damning blot upon his character—the murder of his mother.

That wretched princess was spending the last year of a life which had scarcely passed its full prime in detested infamy, such as in our own history attended the last stage in the career of the Countess of Somerset, the wife of James's unworthy favourite, Robert Carr. Worse than this, she lived in daily dread of assassination. Her watchfulness evaded all attempts at poisoning, and she was partly protected

against them by the current fiction that she had fortified herself by the use of antidotes. Plots to murder her by the apparently accidental fall of the fretted roof in one of the chambers of her villa were frustrated by the warning which she received from her spies. At last, Anicetus, a freedman, admiral of the fleet at Misenum, promised Nero to secure her end in an unsuspicious manner by means of a ship which should suddenly fall to pieces in mid-sea. Nero invited her to a banquet at Baiæ, which was to be the sign of their public reconciliation. Declining, however, to sail in the pinnace which had been surreptitiously fitted up for her use, she was carried to her son's villa in her own litter. There she was received with such hilarity and blandishment, such long embraces and affectionate salutations, that her suspicions were dispelled. She consented to return by water, and went on board the treacherous vessel. It had not proceeded far when the heavily-weighted canopy under which she reclined was made to fall with a great crash. One of her ladies was killed on the spot. Immediately afterwards the bolts which held the vessel together were pulled out, and Agrippina, whose life had been saved by the projecting sides of her couch, found herself struggling in the waves. A lady who was with her, named Acerronia, thinking to save her own life, exclaimed that she was the Empress, and was instantly beaten down with poles and oars. Agrippina kept silence, and escaping with a single bruise on her shoulder, she swam or floated safely till she was picked up by a boat sent from the shore, which was glittering with lights and thronged with visitors who were enjoying the cool evening air. The wretched victim saw through the whole plot, but thought it

best to treat the matter as an accident, and sent one of her freedmen, named Agerinus, to announce to Nero her fortunate escape. Nero had already received the news with unfeigned alarm. Would the haughty, vindictive woman fire the soldiery with the tale of her wrongs? would she throw herself on the compassion of the Senate and the people? would she arm her slaves to take vengeance on her murderer? Burrus and Seneca were hastily summoned. To them the Emperor appealed in the extreme agitation of unsuccessful guilt. In silence and anguish the soldier and the Stoic felt, as they listened to the tale, how fatal to their reputation was their prosperous complicity with the secrets of such a court. Seneca was the first to break the silence. He asked his colleague "whether the Prætorians should be ordered to put her to death." In that hour he must have tasted the very dregs of the bitter cup of moral degradation. Perhaps the two ministers excused themselves with the sophism that things had now gone too far to prevent the commission of a crime, and that either Agrippina or Nero must perish. But Burrus replied that "the Prætorians would never lift a hand against the daughter of their beloved Germanicus. Let Anicetus fulfil his promises." Miserable soldier! miserable philosopher! Stoicism has been often exalted at the expense of Christianity. Let the world remember the two scenes, in one of which the polished Stoic, in the other the Christian Apostle stood—the one a magnificent minister, the other a fettered prisoner—in the presence of the lord of the world!

Anicetus rose to the occasion, and, amid the ecstatic expressions of Nero's gratitude, claimed as his own the

consummation of the deed. On the arrival of Agerinus with the message of Agrippina, Anicetus suddenly flung a dagger at the wretched man's feet, and then, declaring that Agrippina had sent him to murder her son, loaded him with chains. By this transparent device he hoped to persuade the world that Agrippina had been detected in a conspiracy, and had committed suicide from very shame. The news of her recent peril had caused the wildest excitement among the idlers on the shore. Anicetus, with his armed emissaries, had to assume a threatening attitude as he made his way through the agitated throng. Surrounding the villa and bursting open the door, he seized the few slaves who yet lingered near the chamber of their mistress. Within that chamber, by the light of a single lamp, Agrippina, attended only by one handmaid, was awaiting in intense anxiety and with misgivings which became deeper and deeper at every moment, the suspicious delay in the return of her faithful messenger. The slave-girl rose and left the room. "Do you too desert me?" she exclaimed; and at that moment the door was darkened by the entrance of Anicetus, with the trierarch Herculeius and the naval centurion Obaritus. "If you have come to inquire about my health," said the undaunted woman, "say that I have recovered. If to commit a crime, I will not believe that you have my son's orders; he would not command a matricide." Returning no answer, the murderers surrounded her bed, and the trierarch struck her on the head with his stick. "Strike my womb," she exclaimed, as the centurion drew his sword, "it bore a Nero." These were her last words before she sank down slain with many wounds. There is no need

to darken with further and unaccredited touches of horror the dreadful story of her end. The old presage which she had accepted was fulfilled. She had made her son an Emperor, and he had rewarded her by assassination. Such was the awful unpitied end of one on whose birthday and in whose honour in that very year altars had smoked with sacrifices offered at the feet of the god *Honour* and the goddess *Concordia*.[1]

When the crime was over, Nero first perceived its magnitude, and was seized with the agony of a too brief terror and remorse. There is in great crimes an awful power of illumination. They light up the conscience with a glare which shows all things in their true hideousness. He spent the night in oppressive silence. For the first time in his life his sleep was disturbed by dreams. He often started up in terror, and dreaded the return of dawn. The gross flattery and hypocritical congratulations of his friends soon dissipated all personal alarm. But scenes cannot change their aspect so easily as the countenances of men, and there was to him a deadly look in the sea and shore. From the lofty summit of Misenum ghostly wailings and the blast of a solitary trumpet seemed to reach him from his mother's grave. He despatched a letter to the Senate, full of the ingenious and artificial turns of expression which betrayed, alas! the style of Seneca; and in it he charged his mother's memory with the very crimes of which he had himself been guilty. But though he recalled her enemies from exile, and threw down her statues, and raked up every evil action of her life, and insinuated that she had been the cause

[1] As shown by inscriptions of the Fratres Arvales (De Rossi, *Bull. Archéol.*, 1866). See Champagny, *Les Césars*, ii. 194.

of the enormities which had disgraced the reign of Claudius, men hardly affected to believe his exculpation, and the very mob charged him with matricide in their epigrams and scribblings on the statues and walls of Rome.[1] But yet when he returned to Rome the whole populace, from the Senate downwards, poured forth to give him a reception so enthusiastic and triumphant that every remnant of shame was dispelled from his mind. Feeling for the first time that no wickedness was too abnormal to shake his absolute power over a nation of slaves, he plunged without stint or remorse into that career of infamy which has made his name the synonym of everything which is degraded, cruel, and impure.[2]

Through the separate details of that career we need not follow him. The depths[3] into which he sank are too abysmal for utterance. Even Pagan historians could not without a blush hold up a torch in those crypts of shame.[4] How he established games in which he publicly appeared upon the stage, and compelled members of the noblest Roman families to imitate his degradation; on how vast a scale, and with how vile a stain, he deliberately corrupted the whole tone of Roman society; how he openly declared that the consummation of art was a false æstheticism, corrupt and naked, and not ashamed;[5] how he strove to revive the flagging pulse of exhausted pleasure by unheard-of enormities, and strove to make shame shameless by undisguised publicity; how he put to death the last

[1] Suet. *Ner.* 3; Dion Cass. lxi. 16.
[2] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 13.
[3] Rev. ii. 24.
[4] 2 Cor. iv. 2.
[5] Suet. *Ner.* lxxx. 29. 30; Dion Cass. lxi. 4, 5.

descendant of Augustus,[1] the last descendant of Tiberius, and the last descendant of the Claudii; how he ended the brief but heartrending tragedy of the life of Octavia by defaming her innocence, driving her to the island of Pandataria, and there enforcing her assassination under circumstances so sad as might have moved the hardiest villain to tears; how he hastened by poison the death of Burrus, and entrusted the vast power of the Prætorian command to Tigellinus, one of the vilest of the human race; how, when he had exhausted the treasures amassed by the dignified economy of Claudius, he filled his coffers by confiscating the estates of innocent victims; how he caused the death of his second wife, Poppæa, by a kick inflicted on her when she was in a delicate condition; how, after the detection of the conspiracy of Piso, he seemed to revel in blood; how he ordered the death of Seneca; how, by the execution of Pætus Thrasea and Barea Soranus, he strove to extinguish the last embers of Roman magnanimity, and to slay "virtue itself;"[2] how wretches like Vatinius became the cherished favourites of his court; how his reign degenerated into one perpetual orgy, at once monstrous and vulgar;—into these details, fortunately, we need not follow his awful career. His infamous follies and cruelties in Greece; his dismal and disgraceful fall—a tragedy without pathos, and a ruin without dignity—all this must be read in the pages of contemporary historians. Probably no man who ever lived has crowded into fourteen years of life so black a catalogue of iniquities as this Collot d'Herbois upon

[1] A son of the M. Jun. Silanus whom Gaius called "the golden sheep" (Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 9).

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 21.

an imperial throne. The seeds of innumerable vices were latent in the soil of his disposition, and the hot-bed of absolutism forced them into rank growth. To speak thus much of him and of his reign has been necessary, because he was the epitome of the age in which he lived —the consummate flower of Pagan degradation at the time when the pure bud of Christian life was being nurtured into beauty, amid cold and storm. But here we must for the present leave the general story of his reign, to give our attention to the one event which brought him into collision with the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BURNING OF ROME, AND THE FIRST PERSECUTION.

"Mira Nero de Tarpeya
A Roma como se ardia
Gritos dan niños y viejos
Y él de nada se dolia.
Que alegre vista!"
—*Spanish Song.*

HAD it not been for one crime with which all ancient writers have mixed up his name, Christianity might have left Nero on one side, not speaking of him, but simply looking and passing by, while he, on his part, might scarcely so much as have heard of the existence of Christians amid the crowded thousands of his capital. That crime was the burning of Rome; and by precipitating the Era of Martyrdom, it brought him into immediate and terrible connexion with the Church of Christ.

Whether he was really guilty or not of having ordered that immense conflagration, it is certain that he was suspected of it by his contemporaries, and has been charged with it by many historians of his country.[1] It is certain, also, that his head had been full for years of the image of flaming cities; that he used to say that Priam was to be congratulated on having seen the ruin of Troy; that he was never able to resist the

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 67 (cf. 38); Suet. *Ner.* 38; Dion Cass. lxii. 16; Pliny, *H. N.* xvii. 1, 1; followed by Orosius, Sulpicius, Severus, Eutropius, etc.

fixed idea of a crime;[1] that the year following he gave a public recitation of a poem called *Troica*, from the orchestra of the theatre, and that this was only the burning of Rome under a thin disguise;[2] and that just before his flight he meditated setting fire to Rome once more.[3] It was rumoured that when some one had told him how Gaius used to quote the phrase of Euripides—

> "When I am dead, sink the whole earth in flames!"

he replied, "Nay, but while I live!" He was accused of the ambition of destroying Rome, that he might replace its tortuous and narrow lanes with broad, regular streets and uniform Hellenic edifices, and so have an excuse for changing its name from Rome to Neropolis. It was believed that in his morbid appetite for new sensations he was quite capable of devising a truly artistic spectacle which would thrill his jaded æstheticism, and supply him with vivid imagery for the vapid antitheses of his poems. It was both believed and recorded, that during the terrors of the actual spectacle, he had climbed the Tower of Mæcenas, had expressed his delight at what he called "the flower and loveliness of the flames," and in his scenic dress had sung on his own private stage the "Capture of Ilium."[4] It was said

[1] Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, p. 144.

[2] Dion Cass. lxii. 29; Juv. viii. 221. Eutropius says that he burnt Rome: "Ut spectaculi ejus imaginem cerneret quali olim Troja capta evaserat." Ampère says, "Pour moi j'incline à l'admettre" (*Hist. Rom.* ii. 56). Renan thinks that this poem may have originated the metaphor that he played his lyre over the ruins of his country—which was afterwards taken literally.

[3] Suet. *Ner.* 43.

[4] The one circumstance which tends to exculpate him from some of these motives is that he was at Antium when the fire broke out, and did not arrive in Rome till the third day, when the flames had rolled to the gardens of Mæcenas, and his own "Domus Transitoria" (Tac. *Ann.* xv.). The late Mr. G. H. Lewes attempted to "rehabilitate" the character of Nero; but the evidence against him is too unanimous to be set aside.

that all attempts to quench the fire had been forcibly resisted; that men had been seen hurling lighted brands upon various buildings, and shouting that they had orders for what they did; that men of even Consular rank had detected Nero's slaves on their own property with tow and torches, and had not ventured to touch them; that when the wind had changed, and there was a lull in the conflagration, it had burst out again from houses that abutted on the gardens of his creature Tigellinus. At any rate, the Romans could hardly have been mistaken in thinking that Nero might have done much more than he did, to encourage the efforts made to extinguish the flames. It was remembered that, a few years earlier, Claudius, during a conflagration, had been seen, two nights running, seated in a little counting-office with two baskets full of silver at his side, to encourage the firemen, and secure the assistance of the people and the soldiers. Nero certainly, in this far more frightful crisis, did nothing of the kind. Even if some of the rumours which tended to implicate him in having caused the calamity had no better foundation than idle rumour, or the interested plots of robbers who seized the opportunity for promiscuous plunder, they acquired plausibility from the whole colour of Nero's character and conversation, and they seemed to be justified by the way in which he used for his own advantage the disaster of his people. For immediately after the fire he seized a much larger extent of ground than he had previously possessed, and began to rear with incredible celerity his "Golden House," a structure unexampled in the ancient world for gorgeous magnificence. It was in this amazing structure, on which the splendour of the whole Empire was recklessly squandered,

that Nero declared, with a smirk of self-satisfaction, that now at last he was lodged like a human being!

But whether Nero was guilty of this unparalleled outrage on the lives and fortunes of his subjects or not, certain it is that on July 19, A.D. 64, in the tenth year of his reign, a fire broke out in shops full of inflammable materials which lined the valley between the Palatine and Cælian Hills. For six days and seven nights it rolled in streams of resistless flame over the greater part of the city, licking up the palaces and temples of the gods which covered the low hills, and raging through whole streets of the wretched wooden tenements in which dwelt myriads of the poorer inhabitants who crowded the lower regions of Rome. When its course had been checked by the voluntary destruction of a vast mass of buildings which lay in its path, it broke out a second time, and raged for three days longer in the less crowded quarters of the city, where its spread was even more fatal to public buildings and the ancient shrines of the gods. Never since the Gauls burnt Rome had so deadly a calamity fallen on the afflicted city. Of its fourteen districts, four alone escaped untouched; three were completely laid in ashes; in the seven others were to be seen the wrecks of many buildings, scathed and gutted by the flames. The disaster to the city was historically irreparable. If Nero was indeed guilty, then the act of a wretched buffoon, mad with the diseased sensibility of a depraved nature, has robbed the world of works of art, and memorials, and records, priceless and irrecoverable. We can rather imagine than describe the anguish with which the Romans, bitterly conscious of their own degeneracy, contemplated the destruction of the relics of their national glory in the days when Rome

was free. What could ever replace for them or their children such monuments as the Temple of Luna, built by Servius Tullius; and the *Ara Maxima*, which the Arcadian Evander had reared to Hercules; and the Temple of Jupiter Stator, built in accordance with the vow of Romulus; and the little humble palace of Numa; and the shrine of Vesta with the Penates of the Roman people and the spoils of conquered kings? What structural magnificence could atone for the loss of memorials which the song of Virgil and of Horace had rendered still more dear?[1] The city might rise more regular from its ashes, and with broader streets, but its artificial uniformity was a questionable boon. Old men declared that the new streets were far less healthy, in consequence of their more scorching glare, and they muttered among themselves that many an object of national interest had been wantonly sacrificed to gratify the womanish freak of a miserable actor.

But the sense of permanent loss was overwhelmed at first by the immediate confusion, and agony of the scene. Amid the sheets of flame that roared on every side under their dense canopy of smoke, the shrieks of terrified women and the wail of infants and children were heard above the crash of falling houses. The incendiary fires seemed to be bursting forth in so many directions, that men stood staring in dumb stupefaction at the destruction of their property, or rushed hither and thither in helpless amazement. The lanes and alleys were blocked up with the concourse of struggling fugitives. Many were suffocated by the smoke, or trampled down in the press. Many others were burnt to death

[1] Virg. *Æn.* viii. 271; Hor. *Od.*, I. ii. 15, 16.

in their own burning houses, some of whom purposely flung themselves into the flames in the depth of their despair. The density of the population that found shelter in the huge many-storied lodging-houses increased the difficulty of escape; and when they had escaped with bare life, a vast multitude of homeless, shivering, hungry human beings—many of them bereaved of their nearest and dearest relatives, many of them personally injured, and most of them deprived of all their possessions, and destitute of the means of subsistence—found themselves huddled together in vacant places in one vast brotherhood of hopeless wretchedness. Incidents like these are not often described by ancient authors. As a rule, the classic writers show themselves singularly callous to all details of individual misery. But this disaster was on a scale so magnificent, that it had impressed the imaginations of men who often treat the anguish of multitudes as a matter of course.

Even if he had been destitute of every human feeling, yet policy and necessity would have induced Nero to take what steps he could to alleviate the immediate pressure. To create discontent and misery could never have formed any part of his designs. He threw open the Campus Martius, the Monumenta Agrippae, even his own gardens, to the people. Temporary buildings were constructed; all the furniture which was most indispensable was brought from Ostia and neighbouring towns; wheat was sold at about a fourth of the average price. It was all in vain. The misery which it was believed that his criminal folly had inflicted kindled a sense of wrong too deeply seated to be removed by remedies for the past, or precautions for the future. The resentment was kept alive by the benevolences and imposts which Nero now

demanded, and by the greedy ostentation with which he seized every beautiful or valuable object to adorn the insulting splendour of a palace built on the yet warm ashes of so wide an area of the ruined city.

Nero was so secure in his absolutism, he had hitherto found it so impossible to shock the feelings of the people or to exhaust the terrified adulation of the Senate, that he was usually indifferent to the pasquinades which were constantly holding up his name to execration and contempt. But now he felt that he had gone too far, and that his power would be seriously imperilled if he did not succeed in diverting the suspicions of the populace. He was perfectly aware that when the people in the streets cursed those who set fire to the city, they meant to curse *him*.[1] If he did not take some immediate step he felt that he might perish, as Gaius had perished before him, by the dagger of the assassin.

It is at this point of his career that Nero becomes a prominent figure in the history of the Church. It was this phase of cruelty which seemed to throw a blood-red light over his whole character, and led men to look on him as the very incarnation of the world-power in its most demoniac aspect—as worse than the Antiochus Epiphanes of Daniel's Apocalypse—as the Man of Sin whom (in language figurative indeed, yet awfully true) the Lord should slay with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming.[2] For Nero

[1] Dion Cass. lxii. 18.

[2] See Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xx. 19; Lactant. *Div. Instt.* vii. 16; *De Mort. Persec.* ii. *ad fin.*; Chrysost. in 2 Thess., *Hom.* iv; Sulp. Sev. *Hist.* ii. 29; 40, 42; Dial. ii. *ad fin.*; Jer. *in Dan.* xi; Orac. Sibyll. iv. 135—138, v. 362, viii. 1, 153; Verses of Commodianus, in *Spicileg.* of Solesmes, Paris, 1852.

endeavoured to fix the odious crime of having destroyed the capital of the world upon the most innocent and faithful of his subjects—upon the only subjects who offered heartfelt prayers on his behalf[1]—the Roman Christians. They were the defenceless victims of this horrible charge; for though they were the most harmless, they were also the most hated and the most slandered of living men.[2]

Why he should have thought of singling out the Christians, has always been a curious problem, for at this point St. Luke ends the Acts of the Apostles, perhaps purposely dropping the curtain, because it would have been perilous and useless to narrate the horrors in which the hitherto neutral or friendly Roman Government began to play so disgraceful a part. Neither Tacitus, nor Suetonius, nor the Apocalypse, help us to solve this particular problem. The Christians had filled no large space in the eye of the world. Until the days of Domitian we do not hear of a single noble or distinguished person who had joined their ranks.[3] That the Pudens and Claudia of Rom. xvi. were the Pudens and Claudia of Martial's Epigrams seems to me to be a baseless dream.[4] If the "foreign superstition" with which Pomponia Græcina, wife of Aulus Plautius, the conqueror of Britain, was charged, and of which she was acquitted, was indeed, as has been suspected, the Christian religion, at any rate the name of Christianity was not alluded to by the ancient writers who had mentioned the circumstance.[5] Even if Rom. xvi. was addressed to Rome, and

[1] Rom. xiii. 1—7; Tit. iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13. See Tert. *Apol.* 29—33.

[2] 1 Pet. iii. 13—17, iv. 12—19.

[3] Suet. *Dom.* 15.

[4] See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 569.

[5] Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 32.

not, as I believe, to Ephesus, "they of the household of Narcissus which were in the Lord" were unknown slaves, as also were "they of Cæsar's household."[1] The slaves and artisans, Jewish and Gentile, who formed the Christian community at Rome, had never in any way come into collision with the Roman Government. They must have been the victims rather than the exciters of the Messianic tumults—for such they are conjectured to have been—which led to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by the futile edict of Claudius.[2] Nay, so obedient and docile were they required to be by the very principles on which their morality was based—so far were they removed from the fierce independence of the Jewish zealots—that, in writing to them a few years earlier, the greatest of their leaders had urged upon them a payment of tribute and a submission to the higher powers, not only for wrath but also for conscience' sake, because the earthly ruler, in his office of repressing evil works, is a minister of God.[3] That the Christians were entirely innocent of the crime charged against them was well known both at the time and afterwards.[4] But how was it that Nero sought popularity and partly averted the deep rage which was rankling in many hearts against himself, by torturing men and women, on whose agonies he thought that the populace would gaze not only with a stolid indifference, but even with fierce satisfaction?

Gibbon has conjectured that the Christians were confounded with the Jews, and that the detestation universally felt for the latter fell with double force

[1] Rom. xvi. 11; Phil. iv. 22; *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 165.

[2] Suet. *Claud.* 25.

[3] Rom. xiii. 5.

[4] It is involved at once in the "*subdidit* reos" of Tac. *Ann.* v. 44.

upon the former. Christians suffered even more than the Jews because of the calumnies so assiduously circulated against them, and from what appeared to the ancients to be the revolting absurdity of their peculiar tenets. "Nero," says Tacitus, "exposed to accusation, and tortured with the most exquisite penalties, a set of men detested for their enormities, whom the common people called 'Christians.' Christus, the founder of this sect, was executed during the reign of Tiberius by the Procurator Pontius Pilate, and the deadly superstition, suppressed for a time, began to burst out once more, not only throughout Judæa, where the evil had its root, but even in the City, whither from every quarter all things horrible or shameful are drifted, and find their votaries." The lordly disdain which prevented Tacitus from making any inquiry into the real views and character of the Christians, is shown by the fact that he catches up the most baseless allegations against them. He talks of their doctrines as savage and shameful, when they breathed the very spirit of peace and purity. He charges them with being animated by a hatred of their kind, when their central tenet was an universal charity. The masses, he says, called them "Christians;" and while he almost apologises for staining his page with so vulgar an appellation,[1] he merely mentions in

[1] 1 Pet. iv. 14; James ii. 7. There can be little doubt, as I have shown in the *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 301, that the name "*Christian*"—so curiously hybrid, yet so richly expressive—was a nickname due to the wit of the Antiochenes, which exercised itself quite fearlessly even on the Roman Emperors. They were not afraid to affix nicknames to Caracalla, and to call Julian Cecrops and Victimarius, with keen satire of his beard (Herodian. iv. 9; Ammian. xxii. 14). It is clear that the sacred writers avoided the name, because it was employed by their enemies, and by them mingled with terms of the vilest opprobrium (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44). It only became familiar when the virtues of Christians had shed lustre upon it.

passing; that, though innocent of the charge of being turbulent incendiaries, on which they were tortured to death, they were yet a set of guilty and infamous sectaries, to be classed with the lowest dregs of Roman criminals.[1]

But the haughty historian throws no light on one difficulty, namely, the circumstances which led to the *Christians* being thus singled out. The Jews were in no way involved in Nero's persecution. To persecute the Jews at Rome would not have been an easy matter. They were sufficiently numerous to be formidable, and had overawed Cicero in the zenith of his fame. Besides this, the Jewish religion was recognised, tolerated, licensed. Throughout the length and breadth of the Empire, no man, however much he and his race might be detested and despised, could have been burnt or tortured for the mere fact of being a Jew. We hear of no Jewish martyrdoms or Jewish persecutions till we come to the times of the Jewish war, and then chiefly in Palestine itself. It is clear that a shedding of blood—in fact, some form or other of human sacrifice—was imperatively demanded by popular feeling as an expiation of the ruinous crime which had plunged so many thousands into the depths of misery. In vain had the Sibylline Books been once more consulted, and in vain had public prayer been offered, in accordance with their directions, to Vulcan and the goddesses of Earth and Hades. In vain had the Roman matrons walked in

and when alike in its true form, and in the ignorant mispronunciation "Chrestians," it readily lent itself to valuable allegorical meanings (Tert. *Apol.* 3; Just. Mart. *Apol.* 2; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 4, § 18; Bingham, i. 1, § 11).

[1] See, on the crime of being "a Christian," Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 11, § 1.

procession in dark robes, and with their long hair unbound, to propitiate the insulted majesty of Juno, and to sprinkle with sea-water her ancient statue. In vain had largesses been lavished upon the people, and propitiatory sacrifices offered to the gods. In vain had public banquets been celebrated in honour of various deities. A crime had been committed, and Romans had perished unavenged. Blood cried for blood, before the sullen suspicion against Nero could be averted, or the indignation of Heaven appeased. Nero had always hated, persecuted, and exiled the philosophers, and no doubt, so far as he knew anything of the Christians—so far as he saw among his own countless slaves any who had embraced this superstition, which the *élite* of Rome described as not only new, but "execrable" and "malefic"[1]—he would hate their gravity and purity, and feel for them that raging envy which is the tribute that virtue receives from vice. Moreover, St. Paul, in all probability, had recently stood before his tribunal; and though he had been acquitted on the special charges of turbulence and profanation, respecting which he had appealed to Cæsar, yet during the judicial inquiry Nero could hardly have failed to hear from the emissaries of the Sanhedrin many fierce slanders of a sect which was everywhere spoken against. The Jews were by far the deadliest enemies of the Christians; and two persons of Jewish proclivities were at this time in close proximity to the person of the Emperor.[2] One was the pantomimist

[1] Mala, venefica, exitiabilis, execrabilis, prava, superstitio (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Suet. *Ner.* 16; Plin. *Ep.* 92).

[2] Under previous Emperors we read of the Jewess Acme, a slave of Livia, and the Samaritan Thallus, a freedman of Tiberius (Jos. *Antt.* xvii. 5, § 7; *B. J.* i. 33, §§ 6, 7).

Aliturus, the other was Poppæa, the harlot Empress.[1] The Jews were in communication with these powerful favourites, and had even promised Nero that if his enemies ever prevailed at Rome he should have the kingdom of Jerusalem.[2] It is not even impossible that there may have been a third dark and evil influence at work to undermine the Christians, for about this very time the unscrupulous Pharisee Flavius Josephus had availed himself of the intrigues of the palace to secure the liberation of some Jewish priests.[3] If, as seems certain, the Jews had it in their power during the reign of Nero more or less to shape the whisper of the throne, does not historical induction drive us to conclude with some confidence that the suggestion of the Christians as scapegoats and victims came from them? St. Clemens says in his Epistle that the Christians suffered *through jealousy*. *Whose* jealousy? Who can tell what dark secrets lie veiled under that suggestive word? Was Acte a Christian, and was Poppæa jealous of her? That suggestion seems at once inadequate and improbable, especially as Acte was not hurt. But there *was* a deadly jealousy at work against the New Religion. To

[1] According to John of Antioch (*Excerpta Valesii*, p. 808), and the *Chronicon Paschale* (i. 459), Nero was originally favourable to the Christians, and put Pilate to death, for which the Jews plotted his murder. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 22, iv. 26; Keim, *Rom und Christenthum*, 179. Poppæa's Judaism is inferred from her refusing to be burned, and requesting to be embalmed (Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 16); from her adopting the custom of wearing a veil in the streets (*id.* xiii. 45); from the favour which she showed to Aliturus and Josephus (Jos. *Vit.* 3; *Antt.* xx. 8, § 11); and from the term θεοσεβής, which Josephus applies to her.

[2] Suet. *Ner.* 40. Tiberius Alexander, the nephew of Philo, afterwards Procurator of Judæa, was a person of influence at Rome (Jos. *B. J.* ii. 15, § 1; Juv. i. 130); but he was a renegade, and would not be likely to hate the Christians. It is, however, remarkable that legend attributed the anger of Nero *to the conversion of his mistress and a favourite slave.*

[3] Jos. *Vit.* 3.

the Pagans, Christianity was but a religious extravagance—contemptible, indeed, but otherwise insignificant. To the Jews, on the other hand, it was an object of hatred, which never stopped short of bloodshed when it possessed or could usurp the power,[1] and which, though long suppressed by circumstances, displayed itself in all the intensity of its virulence during the brief spasm of the dictatorship of Barcochba. Christianity was hateful to the Jews on *every* ground. It nullified their Law. It liberated all Gentiles from the heavy yoke of that Law, without thereby putting them on a lower level. It even tended to render those who were born Jews indifferent to the institutions of Mosaism. It was, as it were, a fatal revolt and schism from within, more dangerous than any assault from without. And, worse than all, it was by the Gentiles confounded with the Judaism which was its bitterest antagonist. While it sheltered its existence under the mantle of Judaism, as a *religio licita,* it drew down upon the religion from whose bosom it sprang all the scorn and hatred which were attached by the world to its own especial tenets; for however much the Greeks and Romans despised the Jews, they despised still more the belief that the Lord and Saviour of the world was a crucified malefactor who had risen from the dead. I see in the proselytism of Poppæa, guided by Jewish malice, the only adequate explanation of the first Christian persecution. Hers was the jealousy which had goaded Nero to matricide; hers not improbably was the instigated fanaticism of a proselyte which urged him to

[1] Compare what St. Paul says about the virulence of Jewish enmity in 1 Thess. ii. 14—16; Phil. iii. 2. Yet Christianity grew up "sub umbraculo licitae Judaeorum religionis" (Tert. *Apol.* 21).

imbrue his hands in martyr blood. And she had her reward. A woman of whom Tacitus has not a word of good to say, and who seems to have been repulsive even to a Suetonius, is handed down by the renegade Pharisee as "a devout woman"—as a worshipper of God![1]

And, indeed, when once the Christians were pointed out to the popular vengeance, many reasons would be adduced to prove their connexion with the conflagration. Temples had perished—and were they not notorious enemies of the temples?[2] Did not popular rumour charge them with nocturnal orgies and Thyestæan feasts? Suspicions of incendiarism were sometimes brought against Jews;[3] but the Jews were not in the habit of talking, as these sectaries were, about a fire which should consume the world,[4] and rejoicing in the prospect of that fiery consummation.[5] Nay, more, when Pagans had bewailed the destruction of the city and the loss of the ancient monuments of Rome, had not these pernicious people used ambiguous language, as though they joyously recognised in these events the signs of a coming end? Even when they tried to suppress all outward tokens of exultation, had they not listened to the fears and lamentations of their fellow-

[1] θεοσεβής (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 7, § 11). The word means a "monotheist," or proselyte, like σεβόμενος (Acts xiii. 43, xvi. 14, etc.). See Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, pp. 462—469.

[2] As were also the Jews, who were confounded with them. Rom. ii. 22, "Dost thou (a Jew) *rob* temples?" See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 202.

[3] Jos. *B. J.* vii. 3, § 2-4.

[4] As St. Peter and St. John did at this very time. 1 Pet. iv. 17; Rev. xviii. 8. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 10—12; 2 Thess. i. 8.

[5] St. Peter—apparently thinking of the fire at Rome and its consequences—calls the persecution from which the Christians were suffering when he wrote his First Epistle a πύρωσις, or "conflagration." 1 Pet. iv. 12. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 7; Heb. x. 27.

citizens with some sparkle in the eyes, and had they not answered with something of triumph in their tones? There was a Satanic plausibility which dictated the selection of these particular victims. Because they hated the wickedness of the world, with its ruthless games and hideous idolatries, they were accused of hatred of the whole human race.[1] The charge of *incivisme*, so fatal in this Reign of Terror, was sufficient to ruin a body of men who scorned the sacrifices of heathendom, and turned away with abhorrence from its banquets and gaieties.[2] The cultivated classes looked down upon the Christians with a disdain which would hardly even mention them without an apology. The *canaille* of Pagan cities insulted them with obscene inscriptions and blasphemous pictures on the very walls of the places where they met.[3] Nay, they were popularly known by nicknames, like *Sarmenticii* and *Semaxii*—untranslatable terms of opprobrium derived from the fagots with which they were burned and the stakes to which they were chained.[4] Even the heroic courage which they displayed was described as being sheer obstinacy and stupid fanaticism.[5]

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; *Hist.* v. 5; Suet. *Ner.* 16.

[2] The tracts of Tertullian *De Coronâ Militis* are the best commentary on these sentences.

[3] Tertullian mentions one of these coarse caricatures—a figure with one foot hoofed, wearing a toga, carrying a book, and with long ass's ears, under which was written, "The God of the Christians, Onokoites." He says that Christians were actually charged with worshipping the head of an ass (*Apol.* 16; *ad Natt.* i. 16). The same preposterous calumny, with many others, is alluded to by Minucius Felix, *Octav.* i. 9: "Audio eos turpissimae pecudis caput asini . . . venerari." The Christians were hence called *Asinarii.* Analogous calumnies were aimed at the Jews. Tac. *Hist.* v. 4; Plut. *Symp.* iv. 5, § 2; Jos. *c. Apion.* ii. 7.

[4] Tert. *Apol.* 14.

[5] Epictetus, *Dissert.* iv. 7, § 6; Marc. Aurelius, xi. 3, ψιλὴ παράταξις.

But in the method chosen for the punishment of these saintly innocents Nero gave one more proof of the close connexion between effeminate æstheticism and sanguinary callousness. As in old days, "on that opprobrious hill," the temple of Chemosh had stood close by that of Moloch, so now we find the *spoliarium* beside the *fornices*—Lust hard by Hate. The *carnificina* of Tiberius, at Capreæ, adjoined the *sellariae*. History has given many proofs that no man is more systematically heartless than a corrupted debauchee. Like people, like prince. In the then condition of Rome, Nero well knew that a nation "cruel, by their sports to blood inured," would be most likely to forget their miseries, and condone their suspicions, by mixing games and gaiety with spectacles of refined and atrocious cruelty, of which, for eighteen centuries, the most passing record has sufficed to make men's blood run cold.

Tacitus tells us that "those who confessed were first seized, and then on their evidence *a huge multitude*[1] were convicted, not so much on the charge of incendiarism as for their hatred to mankind." Compressed and obscure as the sentence is, Tacitus clearly means to imply by the "confession" to which he alludes the confession of Christianity; and though he is not sufficiently generous to acquit the Christians absolutely of all complicity in the great crime, he distinctly says that they were made the scapegoats of a general indignation. The phrase—"a huge multitude"—is one of the few existing indications of the number of martyrs in the first

[1] "*Ingens multitudo.*" The phrase is identical with the πολὺ πλῆθος of Clemens Romanus (*Ep. ad Cor.* i. 6), and the ὄχλος πολὺς of Rev. vii. 9, xix. 1, 6. Tertullian says that "Nero was the first who raged with the sword of Cæsar against this sect, which was then specially rising at Rome" (*Apol.* 5).

persecution, and of the number of Christians in the Roman Church.[1] When the historian says that they were convicted on the charge of "hatred against mankind" he shows how completely he confounds them with the Jews, against whom he elsewhere brings the accusation of "hostile feelings towards all except themselves."

Then the historian adds one casual but frightful sentence—a sentence which flings a dreadful light on the cruelty of Nero and the Roman mob. He adds, "And various forms of mockery were added to enhance their dying agonies. Covered with the skins of wild beasts, they were doomed to die by the mangling of dogs, or by being nailed to crosses; or to be set on fire and burnt after twilight by way of nightly illumination. Nero offered his own gardens for this show, and gave a chariot race, mingling with the mob in the dress of a charioteer, or actually driving about among them. Hence, guilty as the victims were, and deserving of the worst punishments, a feeling of compassion towards them began to rise, as men felt that they were being immolated not for any advantage to the commonwealth, but to glut the savagery of a single man."[2]

Imagine that awful scene, once witnessed by the silent obelisk in the square before St. Peter's at Rome! Imagine it, that we may realise how vast is the change which Christianity has wrought in the feelings of mankind! There, where the vast dome now rises, were once the gardens of Nero. They were thronged with gay

[1] Compare Oros. *Hist.* vii. 7, "(Nero) primus Romae Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit ac *per omnes provincias* pari persecutione excruciari imperavit; ipsum nomen exstirpare conatus beatissimos Christi apostolos Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit."

[2] Hence the expressions "quaesitissimae poenae" and "crudelissimae quaestiones" (Sulp. Sev. *Hist.* ii. 96).

crowds, among whom the Emperor moved in his frivolous degradation—and on every side were men dying slowly on their cross of shame. Along the paths of those gardens on the autumn nights were ghastly torches, blackening the ground beneath them with streams of sulphurous pitch, and each of those living torches was a martyr in his shirt of fire.[1] And in the amphitheatre hard by, in sight of twenty thousand spectators, famished dogs were tearing to pieces some of the best and purest of men and women, hideously disguised in the skins of bears or wolves. Thus did Nero baptise in the blood of martyrs the city which was to be for ages the capital of the world!

The specific atrocity of such spectacles—unknown to the earlier ages which they called barbarous—was due to the cold-blooded selfishness, the hideous realism of a refined, delicate, æsthetic age. To please these "lisping hawthorn-buds," these debauched and sanguinary dandies, Art, forsooth, must know nothing of morality; must accept and rejoice in a "healthy animalism"; must estimate life by the number of its few wildest pulsations; must reckon that life is worthless without the most thrilling experiences of horror or delight! Comedy must be actual shame, and tragedy genuine bloodshed.[2] When the play of Afranius called "The Conflagration" was put on the stage, a house must be really burnt, and its furniture really plundered.[3] In the mime called "Laureolus," an actor must really be crucified and

[1] See, on this *tunica molesta*, Lucr. iii. 1,017; Juv. viii. 235, i. 155, *et ibi Schol.* Sen. *Ep.* xiv. 5, "Illam tunicam alimentis ignium et illitam et textam." Mart. *Spectac. Ep.* v., x. 25; Apul. iii. 9, x. 10; Tert. *Apol.* 15, 50 (sarmenticii . . . semaxii); *ad Mart.* 5; *ad Scap.* 4; *ad Nat.* i. 18, "*incendiati tunicâ.*" Friedländer, *Sittengesch. Roms*, ii. 386.

[2] Champagny, *Les Césars*, iv. 159.

[3] Suet. *Calig.* 57.

mangled by a bear, and really fling himself down and deluge the stage with blood.[1] When the heroism of Mucius Scævola was represented, a real criminal[2] must thrust his hand without a groan into the flame, and stand motionless while it is being burnt. Prometheus must be really chained to his rock, and Dirce in very fact be tossed and gored by the wild bull;[3] and Orpheus be torn to pieces by a real bear; and Icarus must really fly, even though he fall and be dashed to death; and Hercules must ascend the funeral pyre, and there be veritably burnt alive; and slaves and criminals must play their parts heroically in gold and purple till the flames envelope them. It was the ultimate romance of a degraded and brutalised society. The Roman people, "victors once, now vile and base," could now only be amused by sanguinary melodrama. Fables must be made realities, and the criminal must gracefully transform his supreme agonies into amusements for the multitude by becoming a gladiator or a tragedian. Such were the spectacles at which Nero loved to gaze through his emerald eye-glass.[4] And worse things than

[1] Juv. *Sat.* viii. 187, "Laureolum *velox* etiam bene Lentulus egit;" the actor "was unable *to fly* over the cross." Mart. *Spectac.* vii., "Nuda Caledonio sic pectora praebuit urso. Non falsa pendens in cruce Laureolus Vivebant laceri membris stillantibus artus. . . . In *quo quae fuerat fabula, poena fuit.*" See Suet. *Caius,* 57. Josephus (*Antt.* xix. 1, § 3) alludes to this terrible incident, and so does Tertullian in an obscure but remarkable passage, *adv. Valent.* 14, "nec habens *supervolare crucem* . . . quia nullum Catulli Laureolum fuerit exercitata."

[2] Mart. vii. 8, 21, viii. 30, x. 25; *cf.* θεατριζόμενοι, Heb. x. 33.

[3] The Toro Farnèse had been brought to Rome from Rhodes in the days of Augustus, and may have set the fashion for this *tableau vivant* (Plin. xxxvi. 5, 6; Apul. *Metam.* vi. 127; Lucian, *Lucius,* 23; Renan, *L'Antéchrist,* 171; Tert. *Apol.* 15; Plut. *De Serâ Num. Vind.* 9: πῦρ ἀνιέντες ἐκ τῆς ἀνθινῆς ἐκείνης καὶ πολυτελοῦς ἐσθῆτος; Schlegel, *Philos d. Gesch.* I. ix., p. 332.

[4] "Spectabat smaragdo" (Plin. *H. N.* xxxvii. 57).

these—things indescribable, unutterable. Infamous mythologies were enacted, in which women must play their part in torments of shamefulness more intolerable than death. A St. Peter must hang upon the cross in the Pincian gardens, as a real Laureolus upon the stage. A Christian boy must be the Icarus, and a Christian man the Scævola, or the Hercules, or the Orpheus of the amphitheatre; and Christian women, modest maidens, holy matrons, must be the Danaids,[1] or the Proserpine, or worse, and play their parts as priestesses of Saturn and Ceres, and in blood-stained dramas of the dead. No wonder that Nero became to Christian imagination the very incarnation of evil; the Antichrist; the Wild Beast from the abyss; the delegate of the great red Dragon, with a diadem and a name of blasphemy upon his brow.[2] No wonder that he left a furrow of horror in the hearts of men, and that, ten centuries after his death, the church of Sta. Maria del Popolo had to be built by Pope Pascal II. to exorcise from Christian Rome his restless and miserable ghost!

And it struck them with deeper horror to see that the Antichrist, so far from being abhorred, was generally popular. He was popular because he presented to the degraded populace their own image and similitude. The froglike unclean spirits which proceeded, as it were, out of his mouth[3] were potent with these dwellers in an atmosphere of pestilence. They had lost all love for freedom and nobleness; they cared only for doles and excitement. Even when the infamies of a Petronius

[1] S. Clem. *ad Cor.* i. 6, διὰ ζῆλον διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι ἐπὶ τον τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον αἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι.

[2] 2 Thess. ii. 3; Rev. xi. 7, xii. 3, xiii. 1, 6, xvi. 13, xvii. 8, 11.

[3] Rev. xvi. 13.

had been superseded by the murderous orgies of Tigellinus, Nero was still everywhere welcomed with shouts as a god on earth, and saluted on coins as Apollo, as Hercules, as "THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD."[1] The poets still assured him that there was no deity in heaven who would not think it an honour to concede to him his prerogatives; that if he did not place himself well in the centre of Olympus, the equilibrium of the universe would be destroyed.[2] Victims were slain along his path, and altars raised for him—for this wretch, whom an honest slave could not but despise and loathe—as though he was too great for mere human honours.[3] Nay, more, he found adorers and imitators of his execrable example —an Otho, a Vitellius, a Domitian, a Commodus, a Caracalla, an Heliogabalus—to poison the air of the world. The lusts and hungers and furies of the world lamented him, and cherished his memory, and longed for his return.

And yet, though all bad men—who were the majority—admired and even loved him, he died the death of a dog. Tremendous as was the power of Imperialism, the Romans often treated their individual Emperors as Nero himself treated the Syrian goddess, whose image he first worshipped with awful veneration and then subjected to the most grotesque indignities. For retribution did not linger, and the vengeance fell at once on the guilty Emperor and the guilty city.

"Careless *seems* the Great Avenger: History's pages but record
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt false systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne.
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

[1] τῷ Σωτῆρι τῆς οἰκουμένης.
[2] Luc. *Phars.* vii.
[3] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 74, "Tamquam mortale fastigium egresso."

The air was full of prodigies. There were terrible storms; the plague wrought fearful ravages.[1] Rumours spread from lip to lip. Men spoke of monstrous births; of deaths by lightning under strange circumstances; of a brazen statue of Nero melted by the flash; of places struck by the brand of heaven in fourteen regions of the city;[2] of sudden darkenings of the sun.[3] A hurricane devastated Campania; comets blazed in the heavens;[4] earthquakes shook the ground.[5] On all sides were the traces of deep uneasiness and superstitious terror.[6] To all these portents, which were accepted as true by Christians as well as by Pagans, the Christians would give a specially terrible significance. They strengthened their conviction that the coming of the Lord drew nigh. They convinced the better sort of Pagans that the hour of their deliverance from a tyranny so monstrous and so disgraceful was near at hand.

In spite of the shocking servility with which alike the Senate and the people had welcomed him back to the city with shouts of triumph, Nero felt that the air of Rome was heavy with curses against his name. He withdrew to Naples, and was at supper there on March 19, A.D. 68, the anniversary of his mother's murder,

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 13, "Tot facinoribus foedum annum etiam dii tempestatibus et morbis insignivere," etc.; Oros. *Hist.* vii. 7, "Mox (after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul) acervatim miseram civitatem obortae undique oppressere clades. Nam subsequente auctumno tanta Urbi pestilentia incubuit, ut triginta millia funerum in rationem Libitinae venirent."

[2] Tac. *Hist.* i. 4, 11, 78, ii. 8, 95; Suet. *Ner.* 57; *Otho*, 7; Plut. *De Serâ Num. Vind.*; Pausan. vii. 17; Xiphilin. lxiv; Dion Chrysost. *Orat.* xxi.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 12.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 22, xv. 47; Sen. *Qu. Nat.* vii. 17, 21.

[5] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 22.

[6] Suet. *Ner.* 36, 39; Dion Cass. lxi. 16, 18.

when he heard that the first note of revolt had been sounded by the brave C. Julius Vindex, Præfect of Farther Gaul. He was so far from being disturbed by the news, that he showed a secret joy at the thought that he could now order Gaul to be plundered. For eight days he took no notice of the matter. He was only roused to send an address to the Senate because Vindex wounded his vanity by calling him "Ahenobarbus," and "a bad singer." But when messenger after messenger came from the provinces with tidings of menace, he hurried back to Rome. At last, when he heard that Virginius Rufus had also rebelled in Germany, and Galba in Spain, he became aware of the desperate nature of his position. On receiving this intelligence he fainted away, and remained for some time unconscious. He continued, indeed, his grossness and frivolity, but the wildest and fiercest schemes chased each other through his melodramatic brain. He would slay all the exiles; he would give up all the provinces to plunder; he would order all the Gauls in the city to be butchered; he would have all the Senators invited to banquets, and would then poison them; he would have the city set on fire, and the wild beasts of the amphitheatre let loose among the people; he would depose both the Consuls, and become sole Consul himself, since legend said that only by a Consul could Gauls be conquered; he would go with an army to the province, and when he got there would do nothing but weep, and when he had thus moved the rebels to compassion, would next day sing with them at a great festival the ode of victory which he must at once compose. Not a single manly resolution lent a moment's dignity to his miserable fall. Sometimes he talked of

escaping to Ostia, and arming the sailors; at others, of escaping to Alexandria, and earning his bread by his "divine voice." Meanwhile he was hourly subjected to the deadliest insults, and terrified by dreams and omens so sombre that his faith in the astrologers who had promised him the government of the East and the kingdom of Jerusalem began to be rudely shaken. When he heard that not a single army or general remained faithful to him, he kicked over the table at which he was dining, dashed to pieces on the ground two favourite goblets embossed with scenes from the Homeric poems, and placed in a golden box some poison furnished to him by Locusta. The last effort which he contemplated was to mount the Rostra, beg pardon of the people for his crimes, ask them to try him again, and, at the worst, to allow him the Præfecture of Egypt. But this design he did not dare to carry out, from fear that he would be torn to pieces before he reached the Forum. Meanwhile he found that the palace had been deserted by his guards, and that his attendants had robbed his chamber even of the golden box in which he had stored his poison. Rushing out, as though to drown himself in the Tiber, he changed his mind, and begged for some quiet hiding-place in which to collect his thoughts. The freedman Phaon offered him a lowly villa about four miles from the city. Barefooted, and with a faded coat thrown over his tunic, he hid his head and face in a kerchief, and rode away with only four attendants. On the road, he heard the tumult of the Prætorians cursing his name. Amid evil omens and serious perils he reached the back of Phaon's villa, and, creeping towards it through a muddy reed-bed, was secretly admitted into one of its

mean slave-chambers by an aperture through which he had to crawl on his hands and feet.

There is no need to dwell on the miserable spectacle of his end, perhaps the meanest and most pusillanimous which has ever been recorded. The poor wretch who, without a pang, had caused so many brave Romans and so many innocent Christians to be murdered, could not summon up resolution to die. He devised every operatic incident of which he could think. When even his most degraded slaves urged him to have sufficient manliness to save himself from the fearful infamies which otherwise awaited him, he ordered his grave to be dug, and fragments of marble to be collected for its adornment, and water and wood for his funeral pyre, perpetually whining, "What an artist to perish!" Meanwhile a courier arrived for Phaon. Nero snatched his despatches out of his hand, and read that the Senate had decided that he should be punished in the ancestral fashion as a public enemy. Asking what the ancestral fashion was, he was informed that he would be stripped naked and scourged to death with rods, with his head thrust into a fork. Horrified at this, he seized two daggers, and after theatrically trying their edges, sheathed them again, with the excuse that the fatal moment had not yet arrived! Then he bade Sporus begin to sing his funeral song, and begged some one to show him how to die. Even his own intense shame at his cowardice was an insufficient stimulus, and he wiled away the time in vapid epigrams and pompous quotations. The sound of horses' hoofs then broke on his ears, and, venting one more Greek quotation, he held the dagger to his throat. It was driven home by Epaphroditus, one of his literary slaves. At this moment the

centurion who came to arrest him rushed in. Nero was not yet dead, and, under pretence of helping him, the centurion began to stanch the wound with his cloak. "Too late," he said; "is this your fidelity?" So he died; and the bystanders were horrified with the way in which his eyes seemed to be starting out of his head in a rigid stare. He had begged that his body might be burned without posthumous insults, and this was conceded by Icelus, the freedman of Galba.

So died the last of the Cæsars! And as Robespierre was lamented by his landlady, so even Nero was tenderly buried by two nurses who had known him in the exquisite beauty of his engaging childhood, and by Acte, who had inspired his youth with a genuine love.

But, as we shall see hereafter, his history does not end with his grave. He was to live on in the expectation alike of Jews and Christians. The fifth head of the Wild Beast of the Revelation was in some sort to re-appear as the eighth; the head with its diadem and its names of blasphemy had been wounded to death, but in the Apocalyptic sense the deadly wound was to be healed.[1] The Roman world could not believe that the heir of the deified Julian race could be cut off thus suddenly and obscurely, and vanish like foam upon the water.[2] The Christians felt sure that it required something more than an ordinary death-stroke to destroy the Antichrist, and to end the vitality of the Wild Beast from the Abyss, who had been the first to set himself in deadly antagonism against the Redeemer, and to wage war upon the saints of God.

[1] Rev. xiii. 3, xvii. 11. [2] Hos. x. 7.

Book II.

ST. PETER AND THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

Book II.

ST. PETER AND THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

CHAPTER V.

WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLES AND EARLY CHRISTIANS.

Ἁλιεῦ μερόπων
Τῶν σωζομένων,
Πελάγους κακίας
Ἰχθῦς ἁγνοὺς
Κύματος ἐχθροῦ
Γλυκερῇ ζωῇ δελεάζων.

—CLEM. ALEX. *Paed.* iii. *ad fin.*

When we turn from the annals of the world at this epoch to the annals of the Church, we pass at once from an atmosphere heavy with misery and corruption into pure and pellucid air. We have been reading the account given us by secular literature of the world in its relations to the Church. In the First Epistle of St. Peter we shall read directions which were written to guide the Church in its relations to the world. We have been reading what Pagans said and thought of Christians; in the writings of Christians addressed to each other, and meant for no other eye, we shall see what these hated, slandered, persecuted Christians really were. In place of the turbulence laid to their charge, we shall have proofs of the humility and cheerfulness of their submission. We shall see

that, so far from being resentful, they were taught unlimited forgiveness; and that, instead of cherishing a fierce hatred against all mankind, they made it their chief virtue to cultivate an universal love.

But although we are so fully acquainted with the thoughts and feelings of the early Christians, yet the facts of their corporate history during the last decades of the first century, and even the closing details in the biographies of their very greatest teachers are plunged in entire uncertainty. When, with the last word in the Acts of the Apostles, we lose the graphic and faithful guidance of St. Luke, the torch of Christian history is for a time abruptly quenched. We are left, as it were, to grope amid the windings of the catacombs. Even the final labours of the life of St. Paul are only so far known as we may dimly infer them from the casual allusions of the pastoral epistles. For the details of many years in the life of St. Peter we have nothing on which to rely except slight and vague allusions, floating rumours, and false impressions created by the deliberate fictions of heretical romance.

It is probable that this silence is in itself the result of the terrible scenes in which the Apostles perished. It was indispensable to the safety of the whole community that the books of the Christians, when given up by the unhappy weakness of "traditors" or discovered by the keen malignity of informers, should contain no compromising matter. But how would it have been possible for St. Luke to write in a manner otherwise than compromising if he had detailed the horrors of the Neronian persecution? It is a reasonable conjecture that the sudden close of the Acts of the Apostles may have been due to the impossibility of speaking without

indignation and abhorrence of the Emperor and the Government which, between A.D. 64 and 68, sanctioned the infliction upon innocent men and women of atrocities which excited the pity of the very Pagans. The Jew and the Christian who entered on such themes could only do so under the disguise of a cryptograph, hiding his meaning from all but the initiated few in such prophetic symbols as those of the Apocalypse. In that book alone we are enabled to hear the cry of horror which Nero's brutal cruelties wrung from Christian hearts.

But if we know so little of St. Peter that is in the least trustworthy, it is hardly strange that of the other Apostles, with the single exception of St. John, and —in the wider sense of the word "apostle"—of St. James the Lord's brother, we know scarcely anything. To St. Peter, St. John, and St. James the Lord's brother it was believed that Christ, after His resurrection, had "revealed the true *gnosis*," or deeper understanding of Christian doctrine.[1] It is singular how very little is narrated of the rest, and how entirely that little depends upon loose and unaccredited tradition. Did they all travel as missionaries? Did they all die as martyrs? Heracleon, in the second century, said that St. Matthias, St. Thomas, St. Philip, and St. Matthew died natural deaths, and St. Clemens of Alexandria quotes him without contradiction.[2] The only death of an Apostle narrated in the New Testament is narrated in two words, *ἀνεῖλε μαχαίρᾳ*—"slew with the sword." It is the martyrdom of St. James the Elder,

[1] Clem. Alex. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 4. See Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, p. 137.

the son of Zebedee.[1] Of St. Philip we know with reasonable certainty that he lived for many years as bishop, and died in great honour at Hierapolis in Phrygia. Eusebius makes express mention of his daughters, of whom two were virgins, and one was married and buried at Ephesus. It cannot be regarded as certain that there has not been some confusion between Philip the Apostle and Philip the Deacon; but there is no reason why they should not both have had virgin daughters, and Polycrates expressly says that the Philip who was regarded as one of the great "lights of Asia" was one of the Twelve.[2] If we ask about the rest of our Lord's chosen Twelve, all that we are told is of a most meagre and most uncertain character. The first fact stated about them is that they did not separate for twelve years, because they had been bidden by Christ in His parting words to stay for that period in Jerusalem. Accordingly we find that up to that time St. Paul is the only Apostle of whose missionary journeys beyond the limits of Palestine we have any evidence, whereas after that time we find James the Lord's brother alone at Jerusalem as the permanent overseer of the Mother-Church.

We are told that, after the Ascension, the Apostles divided the world among themselves by lot for the purpose of evangelisation,[3] and in the fourth century there was a prevalent belief that they had all been martyred

[1] He became the Patron Saint of Spain from the legends about the removal of his body to Iria Flavia. Compostella is said to be a corruption of Giacomo Postolo (Voss). See Cave, *Lives of the Apostles*, p. 150. The Bollandists still retain the legend first mentioned by Wal. Strabo (*Proem. de XII. Apost.*) that he was martyred there.

[2] Clem Alex. *Strom.* iii., p. 448; Polycr. *ap.* Euseb. iii. 31; Dorotheus, *De Vit. et Mort. Apost.*; Isidor. Pelus. *Epp.* i. 447, etc. Metaphrastes and Nicephorus add various fables.

[3] Socrates, *H. E.* i. 19.

before the destruction of Jerusalem, excepting John. This, however, can have only been an *à priori* conjecture, and there is no evidence which can be adduced in its support.

The sum total, then, of what tradition asserts about these Apostles, omitting the worst absurdities and the legendary miracles, is as follows :—

St. Andrew, determining to convert the Scythians,[1] visited on the way Amynsus, Trapezus, Heraclea, and Sinope. After being nearly killed by the Jews at Sinope, he was miraculously healed, visited Neo-Cæsarea and Samosata, returned to Jerusalem, and thence went to Byzantium, where he appointed Stachys to be a bishop. After various other travels and adventures he was martyred at Patræ by Ægeas, Proconsul of Achaia, by being crucified on the decussate cross now known as the cross of St. Andrew.[2]

St. Bartholomew (Nathanael) is said to have travelled to India, and to have carried thither St. Matthew's Gospel.[3] After preaching in Lycaonia and Armenia, it is asserted that he was either flayed or crucified head downwards at Albanopolis in Armenia. The pseudo-Dionysius attributes to him the remarkable saying that "Theology is both large and very small, and the Gospel broad and great, and also compressed."[4]

St. Matthew is said to have preached in Parthia and Æthiopia, and to have been martyred at Naddaber in

[1] Origen *ap.* Euseb. iii. 1.

[2] See Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1; Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 39. In Hesychius *ap.* Photium, *Cod.* 269, is first found his address to his cross. The *Acta Andreae* (Tischendorf, *Act. Apocr.*, p. 105 ff.) are among the best of their kind.

[3] Euseb. v. 10; Sophronius *ap.* Jer. *De Script. Eccl.*

[4] *De Mystic. Theol.* i. 3.

the latter country.[1] According to St. Clemens, he lived only on herbs,[2] practising a mode of life which was Essene in its simplicity and self-denial.

St. Thomas is called the Apostle of India, and is said to have founded the Christian communities in India who still call themselves by his name. But this seems to be a mistake. Theodoret says that the Thomas who established these churches was a Manichee, and the "Acts of Thomas" are Manichean in tendency. Origen says that the Apostle preached in Parthia.[3] His grave was shown at Edessa in the fourth century.[4]

St. James the Less, the son of Alphæus, who is distinguished by the Greek Church from James the Lord's brother, is said to have been crucified while preaching at Ostrakine in Lower Egypt.[5]

St. Simon Zelotes is variously conjectured to have preached and to have been crucified at Babylonia or in the British Isles.[6]

Judas, Lebbæus, or Thaddæus, is said to have been despatched by St. Thomas to Abgar, King of Edessa, and to have been martyred at Berytus.[7]

Scanty, contradictory, late, and unauthenticated notices, founded for the most part on invention or a sense of ecclesiastical fitness, and recorded chiefly by writers like Gregory of Tours late in the sixth century, and Nicephorus late in the fourteenth, are obviously valueless. All that we can deduce from them is the belief, of which we see glimpses even in Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, that the Apostles preached

[1] Niceph. *l.c.*; Metaphr. *ad Aug.* 24; Fortunatus, *De Senat.* vii. Various fables are added in Niceph. ii. 41.

[2] *Paedag.* ii. 1. [3] Orig. *ap.* Euseb. iii. 1.

[4] Chrys. *Hom. in Hebr.* xxvi. [5] Niceph. ii. 40.

[6] Niceph. viii. 30. [7] Dorotheus, *De Vit. Apost.*; Niceph. ii. 40.

far and wide, and that more than one of them were martyred. It would be strange if none of the Twelve met with such an end in preaching among Pagan and barbarous nations; and that they did so preach is rendered likely by the extreme antiquity and the marked Judæo-Christian character of Churches which still exist in Persia, India, Egypt, and Abyssinia.

But in the silence and obscurity which thus falls over the personal history and final fate of the Twelve whom Christ chose to be nearest to Him on earth, how invaluable is the boon of knowledge respecting the thoughts, and to some extent even the lives, of such Apostles as St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John, as well as of St. Jude, and St. James the Lord's brother, and the eloquent writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And the boon is all the richer from the Divine diversity of thought thus preserved for us. For each of these Apostolic writers, though they are one in their faith, yet approaches the hopes and promises of Christianity from a different point of view; each one gives us a fresh aspect of many-sided truths.

Let us imagine what would have been our position, if, in the providence of God, we had not been suffered to possess these works, of which the greater number belong to the closing epoch of the New Testament Canon.

The New Testament would then have consisted exclusively of the works of five writers—the four Evangelists and St. Paul.

The Synoptists, in spite of well-marked minor differences in their point of view, present for the most part a single—mainly the external and historical—aspect of the life of Christ. We find in them a compressed

and fragmentary outline of the work of Christ's public ministry, and even this is almost confined to details about one year of His work and one region of His ministry,[1] followed by a fuller account of His Betrayal, Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection. In the fourth Gospel alone we have a sketch of the Judæan phase of the ministry, as well as the doctrine of the Logos, and a yet deeper insight into the Nature and Mind of Christ. But, with this exception, we should be left to St. Paul alone for the theological development and manifold applications of Christian truth. And yet in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of St. Paul himself, we should have found abundant traces that *his* view of Christianity was in many respects independent and original. Alike from his own pages, and those of his friend and historian St. Luke, we should have learnt the existence of phases of Christianity, built indeed upon the same essential truths as those which he deemed it the glory of his life to preach, but placing those truths in a different perspective, and regarding them from another point of view. We should have heard the echoes of disputes so vehement and so agitating that they even arrayed the Apostles in a position of controversy against one another, and we should have found traces that though those disputes were conducted with such Christian forbearance on both sides as to prevent their degenerating into schisms, they yet continued to smoulder as elements of difference between various schools of thought. Taking the Corinthian Church as a type of other Churches, we should have found that there was a Kephas party, and an Apollos

[1] See the remark of St. John "the Elder" (*i.e.*, the Apostle) in Papias *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24.

party, and a Christ party, as well as a party which attached itself to the name of Paul; and even if we admitted that the Corinthian Church was exceptionally factious, we should have learnt from the Epistle to the Galatians, and other sources, that there were Jews who called themselves Christians, and claimed identity with the views of James, by whom the name and work of the Apostle of the Gentiles were regarded not only with unsympathising coldness, but with positive disapproval and dislike. We should have felt that we were not in possession of the materials for forming any complete opinion as to the characteristics of early Christianity. We should have longed for even a few words to inform us what were the special tenets which differentiated the adherents of St. James, and St. Peter, and St. John, and Apollos from those of the Great Missionary who in human erudition and purely intellectual endowments, no less than in the vast effects of his lifelong martyrdom, so greatly surpassed them all. We should have been ready to sacrifice no small part of classical literature for the sake of any treatise, however brief, which would have furnished us with adequate data for ascertaining the teaching of Apostles who had lived familiarly with the Lord by the Lake of Galilee; or of some other early converts who, like St. Paul himself, formed their judgment of Christianity with the full powers of a cultivated manhood. We should, indeed, have known how Christianity was taught by one who had been living for years in Heathen communities, whose Jewish training at the feet of Gamaliel had been modified by his early days in learned Tarsus, and still more by his cosmopolitan familiarity with the cities and ways of men; but we should have asked whether the Faith was taught in

exactly the same way—or, if not, with what modifications—by a Peter and a John, who had known, as St. Paul had never known, the living Jesus, and by a James the Lord's brother, who spent so many years in the rigid practice of every Jewish observance. We should have been lost in vain surmises as to the growth of heresies. If Marcionism and Antinomianism sprang from direct perversion of the teachings of St. Paul, what was the teaching on which Nazarenes, and Ebionites, and Elchasaites, and Chiliasts professed to found their views? In fact, without the nine books of the New Testament, which will be examined in these volumes, the early history of the Church would have been reduced to a chaos of hopeless uncertainties. We should have felt that our records were grievously imperfect; that only in a unity wherein minor differences were reconciled, without being obliterated—only in the synthesis of opinions which were various, without contrariety—could we form a full notion of the breadth and length, and depth and height of sacred Truth.

Now this is the very boon which the Spirit of God has granted to us. Besides the four Gospels, besides the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, we have nine books of the New Testament which are the works of five different authors, and every one of these brief but precious documents is marked by its own special characteristics.

1. Earliest, probably, of them all is the book which is unhappily placed last, and therefore completely out of its proper order in our New Testaments, The Revelation of St. John the Divine. It marks the beginning of the era of martyrdoms. It is in many

respects exceptionally precious. It is precious as a counterpart to the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament, and therefore as furnishing us with a splendid specimen of a Christian, as distinguished from a Jewish, Apocalypse. It is precious as showing the effect produced on the thoughts and hopes of Christendom by the first outburst of Imperial persecution. It is especially precious as a Christian Philosophy of History, and as giving a voice to the inextinguishable hopes of Christians even in the midst of fire and blood. And besides all this it is precious as furnishing the earliest insight into the mind of the Beloved Disciple, in a stage of his career before the mighty lessons involved in the Fall of Jerusalem and the close of the old Æon had emancipated him from the last fetters of Judaic bondage.

2. In The Epistle to the Hebrews, which is being more and more widely accepted as the work of Apollos, we have a specimen of *Alexandrian Christianity*. Valuable for its singular dignity and eloquence, for the powerful argument which it elaborates, and for the original truths with which it is enriched, it also possesses a very special interest because it gives us a clear insight into the school of thought which sprang from the contact of Judaism and Christianity with Greek Philosophy. Of this Alexandrianism there are but scattered indications in St. John and St. Paul, but it was destined in God's providence to exercise a very powerful influence over the growth and development of Christian doctrine, because it furnished the intellectual training of some of the greatest of the Christian Fathers. Our loss would have been irreparable if time had deprived us

of the earliest and profoundest Christian treatise which emanated from the splendid school of Alexandrian Theology.

The remaining seven treatises of the New Testament are known by the general name of the SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES. Various untenable explanations of the name "Catholic" have been suggested; but in the third century it was used in the sense of "encyclical,"[1] and there can be little doubt that these seven letters were so called because they were addressed not to one city, or even to one nation, but generally, to every Christian. In the West they were sometimes called *Epistolae Canonicae*, but this could not have been the original meaning of Catholic, since Eusebius gives the name to the letters of Dionysius of Corinth.[2] Two of these letters—the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude—belong to the Judaic school of Christianity; two others—those of St. Peter—represent the moderate and mediating position of Christians who wished to stand aloof, alike from Paulinists and Judaists, on the more general grounds of a common Christianity; three—those of St. John—represent a phase of thought in which the chief controversies which agitated the first decades of the Church's history have melted into the distance, or have been solved for ever by the Fall of Jerusalem. At that epoch Truth was beginning to be assailed from without

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25.

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23; Leont. *De Sect.* 27. Theodoret says: "They are called 'Catholic,' which is equivalent to encyclical, since they are not addressed to single Churches, but generally (καθόλου) to the faithful, whether to the Jews of the Dispersion, as Peter writes, or even to all who are living as Christians under the same faith." The word itself simply means "general." Some scholars have argued that the Fathers use it in the sense of "canonical," but this is a *later* usage. See Ebrard's *Appendix* to his edition of 1 *John*.

by new forms of opposition, or corroded from within by fresh types of error.

As we are about to study these Epistles in detail, we may here confine ourselves to a few general remarks respecting them.

3. The Epistle of St. Jude is the work of a non-Apostolic writer, but of one who was known as brother of St. James the Bishop of Jerusalem, and who evidently resembled his more eminent brother in intensity of character and vehemence of conviction. His brief letter is interesting from its very peculiarities. It abounds in original and picturesque expressions, and fearlessly utilises both the Jewish *Hagadóth* and the apocryphal literature, with which the writer's training had rendered him familiar. In the passionate vehemence of its denunciations against Gnostic libertinism it reads like a page of Amos or of Isaiah, and is evidently the work of one who, like so many of the early Jewish Christians, had thought it both a national and a religious duty in entering the Church to remain true to the Synagogue. It is a sort of partial and anticipated Apocalypse, but it rests content with isolated metaphors, instead of continuous symbols.

4. The same stern Judaic character, rendered still more unbending by the asceticism of the writer, marks every page of The Epistle of St. James. Living exclusively at Jerusalem, accurate as the Pharisees themselves in the observance of the Mosaic Law—a scrupulosity which had gained him his title of "the Just"—he was only called upon "to be a Jew to the Jews," and this he was by nature, by temperament, and by training. In the Synod at Jerusalem, where St. Peter proposed emancipation, St. James—even in assenting—proposes

restrictions; and while St. Peter, almost in Pauline language, declares that neither Jew nor Gentile can be saved except "through the grace of the Lord Jesus,"[1] St. James, while holding the same faith, urges the claims of Moses, and follows the indications of the Prophets. St. Peter never mentions "the Law;" St. James never mentions "the Gospel." He accepts it indeed with all his heart, but it still presents itself to him as "the Law," though glorified from "a yoke that gendereth to bondage"[2] into a perfect "law of liberty."[3] In reading St. James we can realise the sentiments of the Mother-Church of Jerusalem, and feel that there is no discontinuity in the great stream of Divine Revelation. For him, and for the Jewish Christians of whom he was the recognised leader, Christianity is not so much the inauguration of the New as the fulfilment of the Old.

5. It is necessary, and even desirable, that there should in all ages be some whose mission it is to develop one special aspect of truth, and to stamp the whole of their religious system with the impress of their own powerful individuality. Such, respectively, were St. Paul and St. James. Even in their life-time there were some who exaggerated and perverted the special truths which it was their work to teach. After their death there were Marcionites and Antinomians who perverted the doctrines of St. Paul, and there were Ebionites and Nazarenes who falsely claimed the authority of St. James. But happily there are Christians in all ages who, while they only acknowledge a heavenly master, are anxious to accept truth by whomsoever it is presented to them, yet at the same time

[1] Acts xv. 11. [2] Gal. iv. 24. [3] James i. 25, ii. 12.

to strip it of all mere party peculiarities. Such was St. Peter. He can see the side of truth which either of his great contemporaries represents. He is pre-eminently the Apostle of Catholicity. He had shown in his conduct at Cæsarea that his convictions leaned to the side of the Apostle of the Gentiles; and at Antioch that he could not wholly emancipate himself from the habits induced by lifelong training in the principles of St. James. He was neither able nor willing wholly to shake off the spell of personal ascendency exercised over him alike by the great world-missionary and by the unbending Bishop of Jerusalem. In THE EPISTLES OF ST. PETER we are able to trace the thoughts and expressions of both these great leaders. He dwells with all the energy of St. James on the glory of practical virtue, and with much of the fervour of St. Paul on the distinctively Christian motives and sanctions. But it is no part of his object to follow St. Paul in the logical development and formulation of Christian theology, nor yet to dwell with the exclusiveness of St. James on Christian practice. Even when using language which had been seized upon as the shibboleth of partisans, he strips it of all partisan significance. He was out of sympathy with the spirit which leads to disunion and factiousness by the exclusive maintenance of antagonistic formulæ.

It is interesting to see that the same distinctive peculiarities are continued in later writers of the first and second centuries. In the Epistle of the pseudo-Barnabas we have an exaggerated Paulinism; in the pseudo-Clementines an exaggerated Judaism, which makes a special hero of St. James. St. Peter, standing between both extremes, was claimed by both parties.

Basilides, the anti-Judaic Egyptian Gnostic, claimed to have been taught by Glaucias, the interpreter of St. Peter; and another apocryphal work, which uttered strong warnings against Jewish worship, was called "The Preaching of Peter." On the other hand, St. Peter shares, though in a degree subordinate to St. James, the admiration of the Ebionite partisans who wrote the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. In a less objectionable way, but still with something of exaggeration, Hermas, the author of the famous "Shepherd," reflects the teaching of St. James; while St. Clement of Rome, Catholic, like St. Peter, in all his sympathies, "combines the distinctive features of all the Apostolic Epistles," and "belonging to no party, he seemed to belong to all."[1]

6. There remain THE THREE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN,[2] which may be regarded collectively as the last utterance of Christian Revelation in the New Testament. They are the more interesting not only on this account, but because they are the work of one who had been exceptionally near to the heart of Christ, and had lived for many years face to face with the great heathen world. They are also the work of one who lived to see mighty changes in the growth and fortunes of the Christian Church. He had perhaps been the only Apostle who had seen Jesus die; he had been last beside the Cross, and first in the empty tomb. As one who had watched the death-bed of the Mother of the Lord, he had been one of the very few depositories of the awful mysteries

[1] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 315.

[2] I have gone through every fact and every detail of the Gospel of St. John in the *Life of Christ*, and for that reason I do not touch upon it here.

which it had been given to St. Luke partly to reveal, after they had been pondered for many years in the holy reticence of the Virgin's heart. He had been one of the scattered despairing band who had spent in anguish the awful day in which they knew that Jesus was lying dead, and did not yet understand that He should rise again. For a quarter of a century he was the sole survivor not only of those who had heard the last discourses of the Lord on the evening of His Passion, but even of any who could say, "That which we have seen and our hands have handled of the Word of Life declare we unto you." But his Epistles have yet a further interest as the writings of one who, in his long and diversified experience, had undergone a remarkable change alike of character and of views; of one who had passed from the Elijah-spirit to the Christ-spirit—from the narrower scrupulosity of a Judaist, living in the heart of the Jewish capital and attending thrice a day the Temple worship, to the breadth and width and spirituality of Christian freedom. We have in the Apocalypse a work of his in the earlier stage of his Christian opinions, when he stood for the first time face to face with the Heathen world in its fiercest attitude of anti-Christian opposition. We have in his Gospel and Epistles the sweetest and loftiest utterances of Christian idealism; the strains, as it were, of Divinest music in which the voice of inspiration died away.

It may perhaps be said that our possession of these treasures—especially of some of them—is disturbed by the growing suspicion as to their genuineness. On this score Christianity has little to fear. Every true and honourable man will regard it as a base and

cowardly unfaithfulness to defend as *certain* the genuineness of any book of the Bible of which the spuriousness can be shown to be even reasonably probable. In spite of the conflict which has raged around the Gospel of St. John, we are deeply convinced that the arguments preponderate in favour of those who accept it as the work of the Beloved Disciple. I should find no difficulty in regarding the Apocalypse as being the work of another John if, in spite of some acknowledged difficulties, the Johannine authorship did not seem to be all but incontrovertible. The Epistle to the Hebrews is not a work of St. Paul, but it is pre-eminently worthy of its honoured place in the Canon. The first Epistles of St. Peter and St. John may be said to stand above all suspicion. The Epistles of St. James and St. Jude have less *distinctive* value as parts of the Christian Revelation, but yet have their own inestimable worth, and derive a deeper interest from being the works of "brethren of the Lord." The second and third Epistles of St. John are almost certainly genuine, but whether they be by the Apostle or not is matter of minor importance, because of their extreme brevity, and because they consist for the most part of recapitulated truths. They are but corollaries to the first Epistle, and contain no doctrine which is not found more fully in the Apostle's other writings. The only one of the seven Catholic Epistles against the genuineness of which strong arguments may be adduced is the Second Epistle of St. Peter, which is in any case the book least supported by external testimony. Its genuineness must be regarded as a question for still further discussion, and the recent discovery of its affinity in some passages to the works of Josephus

requires careful attention.[1] In the introduction to each of these Epistles the evidence as to their genuineness is discussed. Many, both in ancient and in modern days, have doubted about some of them. Dionysius of Alexandria and Eusebius, Gaius and Jerome, Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan, Sixtus Senensis and Luther,[2] Zwingli, Calvin, Œcolampadius, Grotius, and many more, have regarded several of them as being at best deutero-canonical,—authentic (if at all) in a lower sense, and endowed with inferior authority; but though the Church of England has shown herself wiser than the Council of Trent in not binding with an anathema the necessary acceptance of the genuineness of every one of them, we have every reason to rejoice that they were admitted by general consent into the Christian Canon.

Enough, I trust, has been urged to show the varied and exceeding preciousness of the writings which we are now about to examine. St. Paul, as has been said, dwells, not of course exclusively, but predominantly, on Christian doctrine, St. James on Christian practice, St. Peter on Christian trials, and St. John on Christian experience;—St. Paul insists mainly on faith, St. James on works, St. Peter on hope, and St. John on love;—St. Paul represents[3] Christian scholasticism, and St. John Christian mysticism;—St. Paul represents the spirit of Protestantism, St. Peter that of Catholicism, while St. James speaks in the voice of the Church of the Past, and St. John in that of the Church of the Future; —St. Peter is the founder, St. Paul the propagator,

[1] *V. infra*, pp. 190-92.

[2] Luther was not by any means the only great theologian, either in ancient or modern times, who adopted a subjective test. There were others also who "*den Kanon im Kanon suchten und fanden.*"

[3] See Schaff, *Hist. of the Church*, 105—110.

St. John the finisher;—St. Peter represents to us the glory of power and action, St. Paul that of thought and wisdom, St. James of virtue and faithfulness, St. John of emotion and holiness.[1] Again, to St. James Christianity appears as the fulfilment of the Old Law, to St. Peter as the completion of the old Theocracy, to St. Paul as the completion of the old Covenant, to Apollos as the completion of the old Worship and Priesthood, to St. John as the completion of all the truths which the world possessed.[2] Such generalisations may be too seductive, and may tend to mislead us by bringing into prominence only one special peculiarity of each writer, while others are for the time ignored. Yet they contain a germ of truth, and they may help us to seize the more salient characteristics. Two things, however, are certain:—One is, that in every essential each of the sacred writers held the Catholic faith, one and indivisible, which is no more altered by their varying individuality than Light is altered in character because we sometimes see it glowing in the heavens, and sometimes flashing from the sea. The other is, that in all these writers alike we see the beauty of holiness, the regenerating power of Christian truth.

But among the writers of the New Testament two stand out pre-eminently as what would be called, in modern phraseology, original theologians. They are St. Paul and St. John. On some of the special differences between them we shall touch farther on. Meanwhile we shall see at a glance the contrast between the dialectical method of the one and the intuitive method of the other, if we compare the

[1] See Stanley, *Sermons on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 4, 5.

[2] See Lange, Introduction to Catholic Epistles, *Bibelwerk*, x.

Epistle to the Romans with the First Epistle of St. John. The richness, the many-sidedness, the impetuosity, the human individuality of the one, are as unlike as possible to the few but reiterated keynotes, the unity, the sovereign calm, the spiritual idealism of the other. The difference will be emphasised if we place side by side the fundamental conceptions of their theology. That of St. Paul is :—

"But now, apart from the law, the righteousness of God hath been manifested, witness being borne thereto by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no distinction: for all sinned, and are falling short of the glory of God, being accounted righteous freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 21—24).

That of St. John is :—

"Herein is manifested the love of God in us, because he hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him" (1 John iv. 9).

It requires but to read the two formulæ side by side to perceive the characteristic differences which separate the theological conceptions of the two Apostles. It is a rich boon to possess the views of both.

We shall be still more inclined to value this precious heritage of Christian thought when we notice that the least important of these Catholic Epistles stands on an incomparably higher level than any of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. This will be shown by a glance at the Epistle of St. Clemens and the Epistle of Barnabas—writings so highly valued in the Church that the first is found in the Alexandrian Manuscript, and the second in the Sinaitic Manuscript, after the Apocalypse, and both were publicly read in churches as profitable "scriptures."

(1) The Epistle of St. Clemens is thoroughly eclectic, but the eclecticism is as devoid of genius and originality as an ordinary modern sermon. It consists in a free usage of phrases borrowed promiscuously from each of the great Apostles, rather than in a real assimilation of their views. The piety and receptivity of the writer is very beautiful, but it cannot be said that it is vivified by a single luminous or informing idea.

(*a*) St. Clemens has read St. Paul and St. John, and St. James and St. Peter, and as a pupil of the last he is animated by a genuine spirit of catholicity; but he does not seem to have realised the essential distinctions which separate their writings. The substance of his views is identical with that which we find in St. Peter and St. James, but he clothes them in expressions borrowed from St. Paul. He says with St. Paul, "We are not justified by ourselves, nor by works, but by faith" (c. xxxii.), and he says with St. James, "being justified by works and not by words" (c. xxx.); but he says nothing to bring into harmony the apparent contradictions. His readiness to accept all moral exhortations and all Apostolic phrases acts as a solvent in which the special meaning of these phrases as parts of entire systems is apt to disappear. Three of the sacred writers refer in different ways and for different purposes to Abraham (Rom. iv.; James ii. 21; Heb. xi. 8). In the syncretism of St. Clemens the allusions made by all three are mingled in one sentence. Rahab, in St. Clemens, is saved by her faith *and by her hospitality*, which is a curious union of James ii. 25 and Heb. xi. 31; and the only original observation which St. Clemens adds is the allegorising fancy that the

red cord with which she let the spies down from the window indicated the efficacy of the blood of Christ for all who believe and hope in God (*Ep. ad Cor.* xii.). Thus the mechanical fusion of two quotations is ornamented by a loose, poor, and untenable analogy, which enables him to add "prophecy" to the faith and hospitality which distinguished the harlot of Jericho.

(*b*) So, too, when St. Clemens speaks of the Resurrection, we see how immeasurably his theology has retrograded behind that of St. Paul. He does not connect it immediately and necessarily with the Resurrection of Christ, but proves it by Old Testament quotations, and illustrates its possibility by natural analogies, especially by the existence and history of the Phœnix! How much would our estimate of inspiration have been lowered—how loud would have been the scornful laugh of modern materialists—had faith in the Resurrection been founded in the New Testament on such arguments as these! Tacitus, too, believed in the Phœnix; but Tacitus does not refer to the fable of its reappearance by way of founding on it an inestimable truth. We are not comparing St. Clemens with Tacitus; we love his gentleness and respect his piety; we are only endeavouring to show how far he stands below the level of St. John and of St. Paul.

(*c*) But still more striking instances might be furnished of the theological and intellectual weakness of this ancient and saintly writer. He never deviates into originality except to furnish an illustration, and his illustrations, even when they are not erroneous, have but little intrinsic value. The worth of his Epistle consists in its earnest spirit, and in its historic testimony to the canonical Scriptures and to

the constitution of the early Church. But how different is its diluted and transitional Paulinism from the force and wealth of the First Epistle of St. Peter!

(2) Nor is it otherwise when we turn to the exaggerated and extravagant Paulinism of The Epistle of Barnabas. Here the inferiority is still more marked: it even leads to decadent doctrine and incipient heresy.

(*a*) The writer has learnt from St. Paul the nullity of the Law as a means of Salvation, but he has not learnt the true and noble function of the Law in the Divine economy. He cannot see that there may be even in that which is imperfect a *relative* perfection. He does not understand the Divine value of Mosaism as God's *education* of the human race. Not content with spiritualising the meaning of the Law, he speaks of its literal meaning in terms of such contempt as almost to compromise the authority of the Old Testament altogether. He ventures to say that the circumcision of the flesh was an inspiration of "an evil angel" (c. ix.). When a writer has gone so far as this, he is perilously near to actual Gnosticism. In his attempt to allegorise the distinction between clean and unclean animals (c. x.) he is seen at his very worst. A single chapter so full of errors and follies, if found in any canonical book, would have sufficed to drag down the authority of Scripture into the dust.

(*b*) Again, like the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Barnabas—for that may have been his name, though he was not the Apostle—is acquainted with Alexandrian methods of exegesis. But his use of them is indiscriminate and unsatisfactory. The Israelites had been promised a land flowing with milk and honey; Barnabas proceeds to allegorise the promise as follows:—

Adam was made of earth; the earth therefore signifies the Incarnation of Christ; milk and honey, which are suitable to infants, signify the new birth. Thus the Old Testament is a prophecy of the New! On this demonstration the author looks with such special complacency that he quotes it as a memorable example of true knowledge (*gnosis*).

(*c*) Again, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had proved from Scripture that there still remains a Sabbath-rest (*Sabbatismos*) for the people of God. Barnabas connects this with what he calls an Etrurian tradition, and originates the notion that the world is to be burned up in the year 6000 after the Creation. Again, he has learnt the general conception of numerical exegesis (*gematria*) from Jewish and Alexandrian sources, and he is specially proud of pressing Abraham's 318 servants into a mystic prophecy of the Crucifixion, because 318 is represented by *IHT*, of which *IH* stands for Jesus, and *T* for the cross. This is a style of exegesis Rabbinic, but not Christian. No one can read the Epistle of Barnabas after the Epistle to the Hebrews without seeing that the former is not only immeasurably inferior, but that it is *so* inferior as to tremble on the verge of dangerous heresy. Let the reader compare the reference to the Day of Atonement in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. vii.) with that in the Epistle to the Hebrews—let him contrast the numerous errors and monstrously crude typology of the former with the splendid spiritualism of the latter—let him notice how tasteless are the fancies of this unknown Barnabas, and how absurd are many of his statements—and he will see the difference between canonical and uncanonical books, and learn to

feel a deeper gratitude for the superintending Providence which, even in ages of ignorance and simplicity, obviated the danger of any permanent confusion between the former and the latter.[1]

We have already seen what the condition of the world was like, let us sum up its points of contrast with the general picture presented by the early Christian Church.

To represent the Christian Church as ideally pure, as stainlessly excellent and perfect, would be altogether a mistake. The Christians of the first days were men and women of like passions with ourselves. They sinned as we sin, and suffered as we suffer; they were inconsistent as we are inconsistent, fell as we fall, and repented as we repent. Hatred and party-spirit, rancour and misrepresentation, treachery and superstition, innovating audacity and unspiritual retrogressions were known among them as among us. And yet, with all their faults and failings, they were as salt amid the earth's corruption; the true light had shined in their hearts, and they were the light of the world. The lords of earth were such men as Tiberius and Caligula, and Nero and Domitian; the rulers of the Church were a James, a Peter, a Paul, a John. The literary men of the world were a Martial and a Petronius; the Church was producing the Apocalypse, the Epistle to the Hebrews,

[1] The same result would follow from comparing the Shepherd of Hermas with the Apocalypse. On these writings we may refer to Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* ii.; Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Väter;* Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeitalter;* Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers;* Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome;* Pfleiderer, *Paulinismus,* ii.; Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche.*

the Gospel of St. John. The art of the world was degraded by such infamous pictures as those on the walls of Pompeii; that of the Church consisted in the rude but pure and joyous emblems scrawled on the soft *tufa* of the catacombs. The amusements of the world were pitilessly sanguinary or shamefully corrupt; those of the Christians were found in gatherings at once social and religious, as bright as they could be made by the gaiety of innocent and untroubled hearts. In the world infanticide was infamously universal; in the Church the baptised little ones were treated as those whose angels beheld the face of our Father in Heaven. In the world slavery was rendered yet more intolerable by the cruelty and impurity of masters; in the Church the Christian slave, welcomed as a friend and a brother, often holding a position of ministerial dignity, was emancipated in all but name. In the world marriage was detested as a disagreeable necessity, and its very meaning was destroyed by the frequency and facility of divorce; in the Church it was consecrated and honourable — the institution which had alone survived the loss of Paradise—and was all but sacramental in its Heaven-appointed blessedness. The world was settling into the sadness of unalleviated despair; the Church was irradiated by an eternal hope, and rejoicing with a joy unspeakable and full of glory. In the world men were "hateful and hating one another;" in the Church the beautiful ideal of human brotherhood was carried into practice. The Church had learnt her Saviour's lessons. A redeemed humanity was felt to be the loftiest of dignities; man was honoured for being simply man; every soul was regarded as precious, because for every soul Christ died; the sick

were tended, the poor relieved; labour was represented as noble, not as a thing to be despised; purity and resignation, peacefulness and pity, humility and self-denial, courtesy and self-respect were looked upon as essential qualifications for all who were called by the name of Christ. The Church felt that the innocence of her baptised members was her most irresistible form of apology; and all her best members devoted themselves to that which they regarded as a sacred task—the breaking down of all the middle walls of partition in God's universal temple, the obliteration of all minor and artificial distinctions, and the free development of man's spiritual nature.

CHAPTER VI.

ST. PETER.

Ἔκκριτος ἦν τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ στόμα τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ κορυφὴ τοῦ χοροῦ.—CHRYSOST. *in Joann.* Hom. 88.

THE early life of St. Peter cannot here be re-written, because in two previous works[1] I have followed the steps of his career so far as it is sketched in the sacred volume. After his youth as a poor and hardworked fisherman of the Lake of Galilee, we first find him as one of the hearers of St. John the Baptist in the wilderness of Jordan. Brought to Jesus by his brother Andrew, he at once accepted the Saviour's call, and received by anticipation that name of Kephas which he was afterwards to earn, partly by the stronger elements of his character, and partly by the grandeur of his Messianic confession. We have already tried to understand the significance of the scenes in which he takes part. We have seen how he was called to active work and the abandonment of earthly ties after the miraculous draught of fishes. We have watched, step by step, the "consistently inconsistent" impetuosity of his character, at once brave and wavering—first brave then wavering, but always finally recovering its courage and integrity.[2] The narrative of the Gospel has brought before us his attempt to walk to his Lord upon the

[1] *The Life of Christ*, 1874; *The Life of St. Paul*, 1879.

[2] "Vrai contraste de pusillanimité et de grandeur, condamné à osciller toujours entre la faute et le repentir, mais rachetant glorieusement sa faiblesse par son humilité et ses larmes" (Thierry, *St. Jérome*, i. 176).

water; his first public acknowledgment of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God; the magnificent promises which, in his person, the Church received; the subsequent presumption, which his Lord so sternly rebuked; the many eager questions, often based upon mistaken notions, which he addressed to Christ, and which formed the occasion of some of our Lord's most striking utterances; the incident of the Temple contribution; the refusal and then the eagerness to be washed by Christ; the warnings addressed to him; the inability to "watch one hour"; the impetuous blow struck at the High Priest's servant; his forsaking of Christ in the hour of peril; his threefold denial; his bitter repentance and forgiveness; his visit to the Sepulchre; the message which he received from the Risen Saviour; the exquisite scene at morning, on the shores of the misty lake, when Jesus appeared once more to seven of His disciples, and when, having once more tested the love of His generous but unstable Apostle, He gave him His last special injunctions to tend His sheep and feed His lambs, and foretold to him his earthly end.

Similarly we have studied, in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, the leading part which he took in the early days after the death of Christ; his speech on the Day of Pentecost; his miracles; his journey to Samaria and the discomfiture of Simon Magus; his kindness to St. Paul; his memorable vision at Joppa; his baptism of Cornelius; his bold initiative of living and eating with Gentiles who had received the gift of the Holy Ghost; the dauntlessness with which he faced the anger of the Jerusalem Pharisees; his imprisonment and deliverance; the manly outspokenness

of his opinions in the Synod at Jerusalem, when he declared himself unhesitatingly in favour of the views of St. Paul as to the freedom of Gentile converts from the burden of Mosaic observances. At this point—about A.D. 51—he disappears from the narrative of the Acts. From this time forward he was overshadowed—at Jerusalem by the authority of James the Lord's brother, throughout the Gentile communities by the genius and energy of St. Paul. This was naturally due to his intermediate position between the extreme parties of Paulinists and Judaists. Among the scattered Christian communities of the Circumcision he maintained a high authority, although it is probable that Christian tradition has not erred in indicating that even among the Jewish Christians of the Dispersion St. James still occupied the leading position. All that we can further learn respecting him in Scripture is derived from his own Epistles, and from one or two casual but important allusions in the Epistles of St. Paul. In the Epistle to the Galatians we read the description of the memorable scene at Antioch, which produced upon the Church so deep an impression. Led away by the timidity which so strangely alternated with boldness in his character, St. Peter, on the arrival of emissaries from James, had suddenly dropped the familiar intercourse with Gentiles which up to that time he had maintained. Shocked by an inconsistency of which he would himself have been incapable, St. Paul, the younger convert, the former persecutor, was compelled by the call of duty publicly to withstand the great Apostle, who by his own conduct stood condemned for inconsistency, and had shown himself untrue to his own highest convictions. Further than this, we learn that

the name of Peter was elevated at Corinth (A.D. 57) into a party watchword; and that he was engaged in missionary journeys, in which he was accompanied by a Christian sister, who (since we know that he was married) was in all probability his wife. From his own Epistles we learn almost nothing about his biography. Nearly every inference which we derive from them is precarious, even when it is intrinsically probable. He writes "to the elect sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," but we cannot be certain that he had personally visited those countries.[1] The question whether his letter is addressed to the Jewish or the Gentile converts is one which still meets with the most contradictory, although at the same time the most confident, replies. He sends his letter by Silvanus; but we are not expressly told that this Silvanus is the previous companion of St. Paul. He sends a salutation from "Marcus my son," but there is nothing to *prove* that Marcus was not his real son,[2] nor have we any certain information that he is referring to St. Mark the Evangelist. In these instances we may, however, accept the general consensus of Christian antiquity in favour of the affirmative suppositions.[3] If so, we

[1] That he had done so is simply an inference from 1 Pet. i. 1. Origen only says, "He *seems* to have preached there" (*ap.* Euseb. iii. 1). See Epiphan. *Haer.* xxvii.; Jerome, Catal. *s. v.* Petrus.

[2] St. Clemens of Alexandria says (*Strom.* iii., p. 448) that he had sons of his own, but their names are not preserved, and they were therefore probably unknown persons. Tradition tells of a daughter, Petronilla (*Acta Sanct.*, May. 31).

[3] Some have supposed that an actual son of St. Peter's is meant, but Origen (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25), Œcumenius, etc., are probably right in supposing that John Mark (Acts xii. 25), the Evangelist, is meant, especially as Papias, Clemens of Alexandria, Irenæus, and others, say that he was the follower, disciple, and interpreter of St. Peter (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39, vi. 14, etc.; Iren. *Haer.* iii. 11).

see the deeply interesting fact that the chosen friends and companions of St. Peter were also the chosen friends and companions of St. Paul—a fact which eloquently refutes the modern supposition of the irreconcilable antagonism between the two Apostles and their Schools. But when we come to the closing salutation—"The co-elect in Babylon saluteth you," the conclusions of each successive commentator are widely divergent. It is still disputed whether "the co-elect" is a Christian Church or a Christian woman; and if the latter, whether she is or is not Peter's wife; and whether Babylon is the great Assyrian capital or a metaphorical allusion to the great western Babylon—Imperial Rome.

Eminent as was the position of St. Peter,[1] the real details of the closing years of his life will never be known. But Christian tradition, acquiring definiteness in proportion as it is removed from the period of which it speaks, has provided us with many details, which form the biography of the Apostle as it is ordinarily accepted by Romanists. We are told that he left Jerusalem in A.D. 33, and was for seven years Bishop of Antioch, leaving Euodius as his successor; that during this period he founded the Churches to which his letter is addressed; that he went to Rome in A.D. 40, and was bishop there for twenty-five years, though he constantly left the city for missionary journeys. The chief events of his residence at Rome were, according to legend, his conversion of Philo and of the Senator Pudens, with his two daughters, Praxedes and Pudentiana; and his public conflict with Simon Magus. The impostor after failing to raise a dead youth—a miracle which St. Peter accomplished—

[1] See Excursus I., on the Asserted Primacy of St. Peter.

finally attempted to delude the people by asserting that he would fly to heaven; but, at the prayer of St. Peter and St. Paul, he was deserted by the demons who supported him, and dashed bleeding to the earth.[1] During the Neronian persecution the Apostle is said to have yielded to the urgent requests of the Christians that he should escape from Rome; but when he had got a little beyond the Porta Capena he met the Lord carrying His cross, and asked Him, "Lord, whither goest thou?" (*Domine, quo vadis?*) "I go to Rome," said Jesus, "to be crucified again for thee." The Apostle, feeling the force of the gentle rebuke, turned back, and was imprisoned in the Tullianum. He there converted his jailer, miraculously causing a spring to burst out from the rocky floor for his baptism. On seeing his wife led to execution he rejoiced at her "journey homewards,"[2] and addressing her by name, called to her in a voice full of cheerful encouragement, "Oh, remember the Lord!" He was executed on the same day as St. Paul. They parted on the Ostian road, and St. Peter was then led to the top of the Janiculum, where he was crucified, not in the ordinary position, but, by his own request, head downwards, because he held himself unworthy to die in the same manner as his Lord.

[1] There seems to have been a similar legend about Balaam, dimly alluded to by the LXX. in the words ἐν τῇ ῥοπῇ, Josh. xiii. 22, and in the Targum of Jonathan, Num. xxxi. 6. See Frankl, *Vorstudien*, p. 187. For the whole legend of Simon Magus see Justin. Mart. *Apol.* ii. 69; Iren. *Haer.* i. 20; Tert. *Apol.* 13; Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 14; *Const. Apost.* vi. 8, 9; Arnob. *adv. Gentes*, ii.; Epiphan. *Haer.* xxi.; Sulp. Sev. ii.; Egesippus, *De Excid. Hieros.* iii. 2 (on Egesippus see Herzog, *s. v.* Heg.); Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 14; *Acta Petri et Pauli;* Ps. Abdias, *Acta Apost.* From these authors it is taken by Marcossius, *De Haereticis*, p. 444, and the Church historians.

[2] τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii.).

In the whole of this legend, embellished as it is in current Martyrologies with many elaborate details, there is scarcely one single fact on which we can rely. For instance, the notion that Peter was ever Bishop at Antioch between the years A.D. 33—40 is inconsistent with clear statements in the narrative of the Acts, in which Paul and Barnabas appear as the leaders and virtual founders of that Gentile Church.[1] Again, if he had *founded* the Church of Rome, or had ever resided there *before* A.D. 64, it is inconceivable that neither St. Luke in the Acts, nor St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, nor again in the five letters which he wrote from Rome during his first and second imprisonments, should have made so much as the slightest allusion to him or to his work. The story of his collision with Simon Magus is a romance. It is founded on St. Peter's actual meeting with the sorcerer in Samaria, which is developed in the Clementines into a series of journeys from place to place, undertaken with the express view of thwarting this "founder of all the heresies." The legend is partly due to a mistake of Justin Martyr, who supposed that a statue dedicated to the Sabine god Semo Sancus[2] (of whom Justin had never heard) was reared in honour of "Simon Sanctus."[3] With these elements of confusion there is mixed up a malignant Ebionite attempt to calumniate St. Paul in a covert way

[1] Acts xi. 19.

[2] Ov. *Fast.* vi. 213; Prop. iv. 9, 74, &c.

[3] He was identified with *Dius Fidius.* The inscription was actually found in 1574, in the popedom of Gregory XIII., on an island in the Tiber, as Justin said. Justin, *Apol.* i. 26; Tert. *Apol.* 13; Baronius, *Annal.* ad an. 44; Gieseler, i. 49; Neander, ii. 162; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 275—277. In this island, now called "The Island of Saint Bartholomew," there was a college of *Tridentales* in honour of Semo Sancus (Orelli, *Inscr.*, 1860–61).

under the pseudonym of Simon Magus, and to imply that St. Peter was at the head of a counter-mission to overthrow the supposed heretical teaching of his brother-Apostle. The notion of this counter-mission is derived from the actual counter-mission of Judaists who falsely claimed the sanction of St. James.[1] The circumstance which suggested the legendary death of Simon in an attempt to fly was the actual death of an actor, who was dashed to the ground at Nero's feet while trying, by means of a flying-machine, to sustain the part of Icarus.[2] If the youthful actor who was condemned to make this perilous attempt was a Christian, who would otherwise have been executed in some other way, we may well imagine that Christians would not soon forget an incident which sprinkled the very Antichrist with the blood of martyrs.[3] But it is possible that the legend may rest on some small basis of fact. Rome abounded in Oriental thaumaturgists and impostors. Simon may have been attracted to a city which naturally drew to itself all the villainy of the world, and there he may once more have encountered St. Peter.[4] But if they met at Rome, all the details of their meeting have been disguised under a mixture of vague reminiscences and imaginary details.

The assertion that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, but that he constantly left it to exercise apostolic oversight throughout the world, is nothing but an ingenious

[1] Acts xv. 24.

[2] On this attempt to fly, see the commentators on Juv. *Sat.* viii. 186; Mart. *Spectac.* vii.; Suet. *Nero*, 12.

[3] "Icarus, primo statim conatu, juxta cubiculum ejus decidit ipsumque cruore respersit. Suet." *l.c.*

[4] As asserted in Justin. *Apol.* i. 26, 56; Iren. *contra Haer.* i. 23, § 1; *Philosophumena*, vi. 20; *Constt. Apost.* v.; Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 13, 14, etc.

theory.[1] The statement that he came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 42, is first found in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, nearly three centuries afterwards, and cannot be reconciled with fair inferences from what St. Paul tells us about the Church. As late as A.D. 52 St. Peter was at Jerusalem, and took an active part in the Synod of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7); and he was then labouring mainly among the Jews (Gal. ii. 7, 9). In A.D. 57 he was travelling as a missionary with his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5). He was not at Rome when St. Paul wrote to that Church in A.D. 58, nor when St. Paul came there as a prisoner in A.D. 61, nor during the years of St. Paul's imprisonment, A.D. 61—63, nor when he wrote his last Epistles, A.D. 66 and 67. If he was ever at Rome at all, which we hold to be almost certain, from the unanimity of the tradition, it could only have been very briefly before his martyrdom.[2] And this is, in fact, the assertion of Lactantius[3] († 330), who says that he first came to Rome in Nero's reign; and of Origen († 254), who says that he arrived there at the close of his life;[4] and of the *Praedicatio Petri*, printed with the works of St. Cyprian.[5] His "bishopric" at Rome probably consisted only in his efforts about the time of his martyrdom to strengthen the faith of the Church,[6] and especially of the Jewish

[1] It was first suggested by Baronius (*Annal.* ad. an. 39, § 25) and Fr. Windischmann (*Vindiciae Petrinae*, p. 112), and hastily adopted by Thiersch (*N. Test. Canon*, p. 104).

[2] This view is now accepted by Roman Catholics like Valesius, Pagi, Baluz, Hug, Klee, Döllinger, Waterworth, Allnatt. See Waterworth. *Engl. and Rome*, ii.; Allnatt, *Cathedra Petri*, p. 114. The Roman Catholic historian Alzog only speaks of the twenty-five years' episcopate as an ancient report (i. 104).

[3] Lactant. *De Mort. Persec.* 2.

[4] Origen *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1.

[5] Cypriani, *Opp.*, p. 139, ed. Rigalt.

[6] Clemens Romanus, third bishop of Rome, speaks even more of St. Paul than of St. Peter (*Ep. ad Cor.* v.).

Christians. Indeed, there is much to be said in favour of the view that the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church in Rome were separated by unusually deep divisions, and possessed their separate "presbyters" or "bishops" for some years. Such a fact would account for some confusion in the names of the first two or three Bishops of Rome. Eusebius—following Irenæus and Epiphanius—says that the first Bishops of Rome were Peter, Linus, Cletus or Anencletus, and Clemens.[1] But Hippolytus (A.D. 225) seems to regard Cletus and Anencletus as two different persons, and places Clemens before Cletus; and Tertullian († 218) says that Clemens was ordained by St. Peter.[2]

The notion of the Apostle's crucifixion head downwards is derived from a passing allusion in Origen, and seems to contradict an expression of Tertullian.[3] It was possibly suggested by an erroneous translation of some Latin expression for capital punishment. At any rate, it stands condemned as a sentimental anachronism, bearing on its front the traces of later and more morbid forms of piety rather than the simple humility of the Apostles, who rejoiced in all things to imitate their Lord.[4] Those who accept these legends must do so on the authority of an heretical novel, written with

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 2, 4, and 21; Iren. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 6.

[2] Tert. *De Praesc. Haeret.* 32.

[3] "Ubi Petrus *passioni dominicae adaequatur*," *De Praesc.* 36.

[4] Neander, *Planting.* p. 377. It is curious to watch the growth of this fiction. It begins with Origen, who simply says that it was done "at his own choice" (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1). To this Rufinus adds, "that he might not seem to be equalled to his Lord" (ne exaequari Domino videretur), which contradicts the saying of Tertullian, that "he was equalled to his Lord in the manner of his death." Lastly, St. Jerome says that he was crucified with his head towards the earth and his legs turned upwards, "asserting that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same way as his Lord" (*De Vir. Illustr.* 1).

an evil tendency, not earlier than the beginning of the third century; or else on that of the apocryphal *Acta Petri et Pauli*, which appeared at a still later date. All that we can *really* learn about the closing years of St. Peter from the earliest Fathers may be summed up in the few words, that in all probability he was martyred at Rome.[1]

That he died by martyrdom may be regarded as certain, because, apart from tradition, it seems to be implied in the words of the Risen Christ to His penitent Apostle.[2] That this martyrdom took place at Rome, though first asserted by Tertullian and Gaius at the beginning of the third century, may (in the absence of any rival tradition) be accepted as a fact, in spite of the ecclesiastical tendencies which might have led to its invention; but the only *Scriptural* authority which can be quoted for any visit of St. Peter to Rome is the one word "The Church in *Babylon* saluteth you."[3]

If, as I endeavour to show in the Excursus, there is reasonable certainty that Babylon is here used as a sort of cryptograph for Rome, the fair inferences from Scripture accord with the statements of tradition in the two simple particulars that St. Peter was martyred, and that this martyrdom took place at Rome. These inferences agree well with the probability that Silvanus, of whom we last hear in company with St. Paul at Corinth, and St. Mark, for whose assistance St. Paul had wished during his Roman imprisonment, were also at Rome, and were now acting in conjunction with the

[1] See Excursus II., on St. Peter's Visit to Rome.
[2] John xxi. 19.
[3] See Excursus III., on the Use of the Name Babylon for Rome.

great Apostle of the Circumcision. The belief that St. Mark acted as the "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτὴς) of St. Peter may have arisen from the Apostle's ignorance of the Latin language, and his need of some one to be his spokesman during his residence and his legal trial in the imperial city.

CHAPTER VII.

SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

"Then all himself, all joy and calm,
Though for a while his hand forego,
Just as it touched, the martyr's palm,
He turns him to his task below."—KEBLE.

THE previous chapter has led us to conclude that the First Epistle of St. Peter was written at Rome. The *date* at which it was written cannot be fixed with certainty. The outburst of the Neronian persecution took place in A.D. 64, but it is difficult to suppose that St. Peter arrived accidentally in Rome on the very eve of the conflagration. It seems more probable that he was either brought there as a prisoner, or went to support the Jewish Christians during the subsequent pressure of their terrible afflictions.[1] In that case he wrote the First Epistle shortly before his death, and he must have been martyred in the year 67 or 68, about the same time as his great brother-Apostle, St. Paul, with whom he is always united in the earliest traditions.

[1] St. Paul seems to have been absent from Rome for two full years before his second imprisonment, and during this time the Christians must still have been liable to oppression and martyrdom, even after the first attack upon them had spent its fury. Tertullian asserts that laws were for the first time promulgated against the Christians by Nero, which rendered Christianity a "*religio illicita*" (*ad Natt.* 74; *Apol.* 5; Sulp. Sev. *Hist.* ii. 29, § 3). This is rendered very doubtful by Pliny's letter to Trajan.

That the First Epistle of St. Peter is genuine—a precious relic of the thoughts of one of Christ's most honoured Apostles—we may feel assured. Its authenticity is supported by overwhelming external evidence. The *Second* Epistle, whether genuine or not, is at any rate a very ancient document, and it unhesitatingly testifies to the genuineness of the first. "The First Epistle is," says M. Renan, "one of the writings of the New Testament which are the most anciently and the most unanimously cited as authentic." Papias, Polycarp, Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen,[1] all furnish indisputable evidence in its favour.[2] The proof that the writer was influenced by the Epistle to the Ephesians is in accordance with the character of the age, for the early Christians, as was perfectly natural, were in the habit of echoing one another's thoughts. Modern writers do exactly the same. The words and thoughts of every writer who makes any wide or serious impression are, consciously or unconsciously, adopted by others exactly as if they were original and independent: and this is true to such an extent that an author's real success is often obliterated by its very universality. The views which he originated come to be regarded as commonplace simply because all his contemporaries have adopted them. But this was still more the case in days when books were very few in

[1] See Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 25, 39; iv. 14, v. 8, vi. 25; Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philip.*; Iren. *contra Haer.* iv. 9, § 2; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 8, iv. 7; Tert. *Scorp.* 12. Besides this, there are many distinct allusions to it in the Epistle of St. Clemens to the Corinthians. Little importance, therefore, can be attached to its absence from the Muratorian Canon, and its rejection by Theodore of Mopsuestia.

[2] Keim (*Rom und Christenthum*, p. 194), without deigning to offer a reason, assigns it to the time of Trajan. [In this he follows Hilgenfeld.

number. The writings of the Apostles are marked by mutual resemblances, and the works of men like Ignatius, and Polycarp, and Clemens of Rome, consist in large measure of a mosaic of phrases which they have caught up from their predecessors.

The style of St. Peter in this Epistle resembles in many particulars the style of his recorded speeches. It is characterised by the fire and energy which we should expect to find in his forms of expression; but that energy is tempered by the tone of Apostolic dignity, and by the fatherly mildness of one who was now aged, and was near the close of a life of labour. He speaks with authority, and yet with none of the threatening sternness of St. James. We find in the letter the plain and forthright spirit of the man insisting again and again on a few great leading conceptions. The subtle dialectics, the polished irony, the involved thoughts, the lightning-like rapidity of inference and suggestion, which we find in the letters of the Apostle of the Uncircumcision, are wholly wanting in him. His causal connexions, marking the natural and even flow of his thoughts, are of the simplest character; and yet a vigorously practical turn of mind, a quick susceptibility of influence, and a large catholicity of spirit, such as we know that he possessed, are stamped upon every page. He aims throughout at practical exhortation, not at systematic exposition; and his words, in their force and animation, reflect the simple, sensuous, and passionate nature of the impulsive Simon of whom we read in the Gospels. Even if the external evidence in favour of the Epistle had been less convincing, the arguments on which its authenticity has been questioned by a few modern theologians have been

so amply refuted as to establish its authorship with completer certainty.

1. It is not so much a letter as a treatise, addressed to Christians in general. It is mainly hortative, and its exhortations are founded on Christian hope, and on the effects of the death of Christ. It is not, however, a *scholastic* treatise, but rather a practical address, at once conciliatory in tone and independent in character. It may with equal truth be called Pauline and Judæo-Christian. It is Judæo-Christian in its sympathies, yet without any Judaic bitterness. It is Pauline in its expressions, yet with no polemic purpose. In both respects it accords with the character and circumstances of the great Apostle. It is completely silent about the Law, and enters into none of the once vehement controversies about the relation of the Law to the Gospel or of Faith to Works. There is no predetermined attempt to reconcile opposing parties, but all party watchwords are either impartially omitted, or are stripped of their sterner antitheses.[1]

2. One proof that it was written by St. Peter results from the natural way in which we can trace the influence of the most prominent events which occurred during his association with his Lord.[2] He does not mention them: he does not even in any marked way refer to them; and yet we find in verse after verse the indication of subtle reminiscences such as *must* have lingered in the mind of St. Peter. Christ had said

[1] See Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeitalt.* ii. 22; Pfleiderer, *Paulinism.* ii. 150, E. T.

[2] Matt. xvi. 18 ; 1 Pet. ii. 4—8. This peculiarity of the Epistle has been worked out and illustrated by no one so fully or with such delicate insight as by Dean Plumptre in his edition of the Epistle in the Cambridge Bible for schools, p. 13, *seq.*

to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church," and he speaks of Christ as "a rock," the corner-stone of a spiritual house, and of Christians as living stones built into it. Christ had sternly reproved him when he made himself a stumbling-block, and he sees how perilous it is to turn the Lord's will into a rock of offence,[1] using the two very words which lie at the heart of those two consecutive moments which had been the crisis of his life.[2] When he had rashly pledged his Master to pay the Temple didrachm, our Lord had indeed accepted the obligation, but at the same time had taught him that the children were free; and St. Peter here teaches the Churches that, though free, they were still to submit for the Lord's sake to every human ordinance.[3] Bound by the quantitative conceptions of Jewish formalism, he had once asked whether he was to forgive his brother up to seven times, and had been told that he was to forgive him up to seventy times seven; and he has so well learnt the lesson as to tell his converts that "Love shall cover the *multitude* of sins."[4] In answer to his too unspiritual question, "what reward the Apostles should have for having forsaken all to follow Christ," he had heard the promise that they should sit on thrones; and throughout this Epistle his thoughts are full of the future glory and of its "amaranthine crown."[5] He had heard Jesus compare the "days of Noah" to the days of the Son of Man,[6] and his thoughts dwell so earnestly upon the comparison that he uses the expression in a way which

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 8, *πέτρα σκανδάλου.*

[2] Matt. xvi. 18, *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*; 23, *σκάνδαλόν μου εἶ.*

[3] Matt. xvii. 24—27; 1 Pet. ii. 13—16.

[4] Matt. xviii. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 8.

[5] Matt. xix. 28; 1 Pet. i. 5, v. 4.

[6] Matt. xxiv 37.

unintentionally limits the fulness of his revelation.[1] He had seen his Lord strip off His upper garment and tie a towel round His waist, when, with marvellous self-abasement, he stooped to wash His Disciples' feet;[2] hence, when he wishes to impress the lesson of humility, he is led insensibly to the intensely picturesque expression that they should "tie on humility like a dress fastened with knots."[3] Perhaps, too, from that washing, and the solemn lessons to which it led, he gained his insight into the true meaning of Baptism, as being not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the intercourse of a good conscience with its God.[4] At a very solemn moment of his life Christ had told him that Satan had desired to have him and the other Apostles, that he might sift them as wheat,[5] and he warns the Church of the prowling activity and power of the Devil, using respecting him the word "adversary" (ἀντίδικος), which occurs nowhere else in the Epistles, but more than once in the sayings of the Lord.[6] Again and again on the last evening of the life of Christ he had been bidden to watch and pray, and had fallen because he had not done so; and watchfulness is a lesson on which he most earnestly insists.[7] He had been one of the few faithful eye-witnesses of the buffets and weals

[1] Compare 1 Pet. iii. 20 with iv. 6.

[2] John xiii. 1—6.

[3] 1 Pet. v. 5, ἐγκομβώσασθε.

[4] 1 Pet. iii. 21. For the "answer" of the A. V. the Revised Version suggests "interrogation," "appeal," "inquiry," *v. infra*, p. 138. The verb ἐπερωτᾶν is common in the Gospels, and always means "to ask further,' but the substantive does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

[5] Luke xxii. 31. Here the *common* danger of the Apostles, "Satan has desired to have *you* (ὑμᾶς), . . . but I have prayed for *thee* (σέ)," is restored by the Revised Version.

[6] 1 Pet. v. 8; Matt. v. 25; Luke xii. 58, xviii. 3.

[7] 1 Pet. v. 8, *seq.*

inflicted on Christ in His sufferings, and of His silence in the midst of reviling, and to these striking circumstances he makes a very special reference.[1] He had seen the Cross uplifted from the ground with its awful burden, and respecting that Cross he uses a very peculiar expression.[2] He had heard Jesus warn Thomas of the blessedness of those who having not seen yet believed, and he quotes almost the very words.[3] He had been thrice exhorted to tend and feed Christ's sheep, and the pastoral image is prominent in his mind and exhortations.[4] Lastly, he had been specially bidden when converted to strengthen his brethren, and this from first to last is the avowed object of his present letter.[5]

3. Again we recognise the true St. Peter by the extreme vividness of his expressions. It has been a unanimous tradition in the Church that the minute details recorded by St. Mark are due to the fact that he wrote from information given him by St. Peter. Picturesqueness is as evidently a characteristic of the mind of St. Peter as it is of the mind of St. Mark. In St. Mark it is shown by touches of graphic description, in St. Peter by words which are condensed metaphors.[6]

4. Such is the close analogy between the thoughts and expressions of the Epistle and those which the Gospel story of the writer would have led us to expect. Nor is the resemblance between the speeches of the St. Peter of the Acts and the style of the St. Peter of the Epistle less striking. As in the Acts so in the Epistle, he refers

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 20, *κολαφιζόμενοι*; 23, *οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει*; 24, *οὗ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ*.

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 24, *ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον*. *V. infra*, p. 128.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 8. [4] 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 2. [5] 1 Pet. v. 12.

[6] 1 Pet. ii. 2, "guileless, unadulterated milk;" iv. 4, "outpouring" (excess of riot); iv. 15, "other-people's-bishop" (busybody in other men's matters).

to Isaiah's metaphor of the rejected corner-stone;[1] in both the witness of the Holy Ghost is prominent;[2] in both he speaks of the Cross as "the tree";[3] in both he dwells on the position of the Apostles as "witnesses;"[4] in both he puts forward the death of Christ as the fulfilment of prophecy;[5] in both the Resurrection is made the main ground of faith and hope;[6] in both we find special mention of God as the Judge of quick and dead;[7] in both the exhortation to repentance is based on the fact of man's redemption;[8] lastly, in both, as a matter of style, there is a prevalence of simple relatival connexions, and as a matter of doctrine there is the representation of God as one who has no respect for persons.[9]

5. Is it not, further, a very remarkable circumstance that in the Acts St. Peter, in one of his outbursts of impetuous boldness, ventures to call the Law "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were strong enough to bear;" and in the Epistle—though he was a Jew, though he was closely allied to St. James in many of his sympathies, though he strongly felt the influence of the Pharisaic Christians at Jerusalem, though he borrows the symbols of the theocracy to a marked extent[10]—does not so much as once mention or allude to the Mosaic Law at all? Even if any of these peculiarities standing alone could be regarded as accidental, their aggregate force is very considerable; nor do we think it possible that a forger—even if a forger

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 7; Acts iv. 11. [2] 1 Pet. i. 12; Acts v. 32.
[3] 1 Pet. ii. 24; Acts v. 30, x. 39.
[4] 1 Pet. i. 8, v. 1; Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, x. 41.
[5] 1 Pet. i. 10; Acts iii. 18, x. 43.
[6] 1 Pet. i. 3, 4, 21, iii. 21; Acts ii. 32—36, iii. 15, iv. 10, x. 40.
[7] 1 Pet. iv. 5; Acts x. 42.
[8] 1 Pet. ii. 24; Acts iii. 19—26. [9] 1 Pet. i. 17; Acts x.
[10] 1 Pet. i. 2 ("sprinkling"), 18—20, ii. 9, 10 (Ex. xix. 5, 6).

could otherwise have produced such an epistle as this—could have combined in one short composition so many instances of subtle verisimilitude?[1]

6. A very remarkable feature of the Epistle, and one which must have great prominence in leading us to a conclusion about its date, characteristics, and object, is the *extent* to which the writer has felt the influence both of St. James and of St. Paul.[2] No one can

[1] To these might be added 1 Pet. i. 13 ("girding up the loins of your mind"): compared with Luke xii. 35; i. 12, "to stoop and look" (παρακύψαι); compared with Luke xxiv. 12; ii. 15, "to put to silence" (φιμοῦν), compared with Luke iv. 35; and the use of the word σκολιὸς (ii. 18), as compared with his use of the same word in his recorded speech (Acts ii. 40).

[2] I pass over as very possibly accidental and independent the few points of resemblance between the language of St. Peter and St. John (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 19, 22 with 1 John i. 7, iii. 3, iv. 11, and 1 Pet. ii. 9 with Rev. i. 6); nor do I think that much importance can be attached to the few coincidences between 1 Pet. and Hebrews (*e.g.*, 1 Pet. i. 2 and Heb. ix. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 2 and Heb. v. 12, etc.). I regard the attempt of Weiss, in his elaborate *Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, to prove the early date of the Epistle, and the indebtedness of St. Paul to its expressions, as misleading and untenable, if not as "altogether futile" (Pfleiderer, *Paulinism.* ii. 150). He has found very few followers in his opinion. The resemblances are mainly to the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians :—

1 Pet. i. 1	Eph. i. 4—7	
1 Pet. i. 3	Eph. i. 3	
1 Pet. i. 14	Eph. ii. 8	Rom. xii. 2
1 Pet. ii. 6—10		Rom. ix. 25—32
1 Pet. ii. 11		Rom. vii. 23
1 Pet. ii. 13		Rom. xiii. 1—4
1 Pet. ii. 18	Eph. vi. 5	
1 Pet. iii. 1	Eph. v. 22	
1 Pet. iii. 9		Rom. xvi. 17
1 Pet. iii. 22	Eph. i. 20	Rom. viii. 34
1 Pet. iv. 1		Rom. vi. 6
1 Pet. iv. 10		Rom. xii. 6
1 Pet. v. 1		Rom. viii. 18
1 Pet. v. 5	Eph. v. 21	

The chief resemblances between St. Peter and St. James will be found in the following passages—

1 Pet. i. 6—7	James i. 2—4
1 Pet. i. 24	James i. 10
1 Pet. iv. 8	James v. 20
1 Pet. v. 5, 9	James iv. 6, 7, 10.

compare the number and peculiarity of the identical expressions adduced in the note, without the conviction that they can only be accounted for by the influence of the earlier writers on the later. At this epoch, both among Jews and Christians, there was a free adaptation of phraseology which had come to be regarded as a common possession. That St. Peter has here been the conscious or unconscious borrower may be regarded as certain, alike on chronological and on psychological considerations. If the Epistle was written from Rome, we see the strongest reasons to conclude that it was written later than the Epistle to the Ephesians, and therefore after the death of St. James. The manner in which St. Peter writes shows that he is often accepting the phraseology of others, but infusing into their language a somewhat different shade of meaning. When we consider the extreme plasticity of St. Peter's nature, the emotional impressiveness and impetuous receptivity which characterise his recorded acts; when we remember, too, that it was his habit to approach all subjects on the practical and not on the speculative side, and to think the less of distinctions in the form of holding the common faith, because his mind was absorbed in the contemplation of that glorious Hope of which he is pre-eminently the Apostle,—we find an additional reason for accepting the Epistle as genuine. We see in it the simple, unsystematic, practical synthesis of the complementary—but not contradictory—truths insisted on alike by St. Paul and St. James. St. Peter dwells

The supposed parallels between the Epistle and those to Timothy and Titus are not real parallels, but arise from similarity of subject (1 Pet. iii. 1, v. 1, *seq.*). There is nothing in these similarities to discredit the authenticity of the Epistle, and the absence of Johannine phrases is another proof of its antiquity.

more exclusively than St. Paul on moral duties; he leans more immediately than St. James on Gospel truths.

7. There is no material difficulty in his acquaintance with these writings of his illustrious contemporaries. Among the small Christian communities the letters of the Apostles were eagerly distributed. The Judaists would have been sure to supply St. Peter with the letter of the saintly Bishop of Jerusalem; and such companions as Mark and Silvanus, both of whom had lived in intimate relationship with St. Paul, and of whom the former had been expressly mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, could not have failed to bring to St. Peter's knowledge the sublimest and most heavenly of the Epistles of St. Paul. The antagonism in which St. James and St. Paul had been arrayed by their hasty followers would have acted with St. Peter as an additional reason for using indiscriminately the language of them both. It was time that the bitterness of controversies should cease, now that the Church was passing through the fiery storm of its first systematic persecution. It was time that the petty differences within the fold should be forgotten when the howling wolves were leaping into its enclosure from without. The suffering Christians needed no impassioned arguments or eager dialectics; they mainly needed to be taught the blessed lessons of resignation and of hope. These are the key-notes of St. Peter's Epistle.[1] As they stood defenceless before their enemies, he points them to the patient and speechless anguish of the Lamb of God.[2] Patient endurance in the present would enable them to set an

[1] *Resignation*, 1 Pet. i. 6, ii. 13—25, iii. 1, 9—12, 17, 18, iv. 1—4, v. 6; *Hope*, 1 Pet. i. 4, 12, 13, iv. 6, 7, v. 1, 4, 6, 10, 11.

[2] 1 Pet. i. 19, ii. 22—25.

example even to their enemies; the hope of the future would change their very sorrows into exultant triumph.[1] In the great battle which had been set in array against them, Hope should be their helmet and Innocence their shield.[2]

8. And yet in teaching to his readers these blessed lessons St. Peter by no means loses his own originality. The distinctions between the three Apostles—distinctions between their methods rather than their views—may be seen at a glance. They become salient when we observe that whereas St. James barely alludes to a single event in the life of Christ, St. Peter makes every truth and exhortation hinge on His example, His sufferings, His Cross, His Resurrection, and His exaltation;[3] and that whereas St. Peter is greatly indebted to the Epistle to the Romans, he yet makes no use of St. Paul's central doctrine of Justification by Faith. Thus even when he is influenced by his predecessor's phraseology, he is occupied with somewhat different conceptions. The two Apostles hold, indeed, the same truths, but, to the eternal advantage of the Church, they express them differently. Antagonism between them there was none; but they were mutually independent. The originality of St. Peter is not only demonstrated by the sixty isolated expressions (*hapax legomena*) of his short Epistle, but also by his modification of many of St. Paul's thoughts in accordance with his own immediate spiritual gift. That gift was the *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*—that power of administrative wisdom which made his example so valuable

[1] *Joy*, 1 Pet. i. 6, 8, iv. 13, 14.

[2] *Innocence*, 1 Pet. i. 13—16, 22, ii. 1, 2, 11, 12, iii. 13, 15, 21, iv. 15.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 3, 7, 13, iii. 22, iv. 11, 13.

to the Infant Church. It was worthy of his high position and authority to express the common practical consciousness of the Christian Church in a form which avoided party disagreements. The views of St. Paul are presented by St. Peter in their every-day bearing rather than in their spiritual depths; and in their moral, rather than their mystical significance. St. Peter adopts the views of his great brother Apostles, but he clothes them in simpler and in conciliatory terms.[1] And if these phenomena, from their very delicacy, constitute an almost irresistible proof of the genuineness of the Epistle, how decisive is the evidence which they furnish that there was none of that deadly opposition between the adherents of Kephas and of Paul which has been assumed as the true key to the Apostolic history! How certain is it that "the wretched caricature of an Apostle, a thing of shreds and patches, which struts and fumes through those Ebionite romances, would not have been likely to write with thoughts and phrases essentially Pauline flowing from his pen at every turn."[2]

9. It is important and interesting to illustrate still more fully this *indebted yet independent attitude* of the Apostle; this tone at once receptive and original, at once firm and conciliatory, by which he was so admirably qualified to be the Apostle of Catholicity.[3]

i. We see it at once in the language which he uses about *Redemption*. St. Peter, of course, held, as definitely as St. Paul, that "Christ suffered for sin,

[1] 1 Pet. i. 12, 25, v. 12 (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1).

[2] Plumptre, *St. Peter*, p. 72.

[3] Weiss's *Lehrbegriff* is entirely vitiated by his capricious effort to make out that St. Peter was the original author of the thoughts which he adopted from others.

once for all, the just on behalf of the unjust;"[1] that "He Himself, in His own body, took up our sins on to the cross;"[2] that we were "ransomed with the precious blood as of a lamb blameless and spotless, even of Christ."[3] But divine truth is many-sided and infinite; and whereas St. Paul mainly dwells on the death of Christ as delivering us from the Law, and from the curse of the Law, and from a state of guilt, St. Peter speaks of it mainly as a liberation from actual immorality;[4] a ransom from an empty, traditional, earthly mode of life;[5] a means of abandoning sins and living to righteousness:—and these are to him the consequences which are specially involved in that more general conception that Christ died "to lead us to God."[6] And besides this different aspect of the object of the death of Christ, the *means* by which that object is effected are also contemplated from a different point of view. In St. Paul's theology the Christian so closely partakes in the death of Christ that, by that death, the flesh—the carnal principle of all sin—is slain within him;[7] the old man is crucified with Christ, and the new man, the hidden man of the heart, the spiritual nature, lives the life of Christ by mystical union with Him. Now, St.

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 18, *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν . . . ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων.*

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 24; on this difficult verse, *vide infra*, p. 161.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

[4] 1 Pet. i. 18, *ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου.*

[5] 1 Pet. ii. 24, *ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν.* Mark alike the resemblance to, and the difference from, the words of the discourse which the Apostle had heard from the lips of St. Paul at a moment of deep personal humiliation (Gal. ii. 19, 20), "for I, through the Law, died unto the Law that I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live." We have in St. Peter the essential Pauline thought without the intensity of the Pauline expression.

[6] 1 Pet. iii. 18; *cf.* Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18; Heb. x. 19.

[7] Rom. vi. 12—14, viii. 3; Gal. v. 24; 2 Cor. v. 14.

Peter uses expressions which at once remind us of those used by St. Paul, but he uses them with a different scope. He too speaks of "a communion with the sufferings of Christ,"[1] but it is only in the *literal* sense of suffering;[2] and he never distinctly touches on (though he may doubtless assume and pre-suppose) the mystery of the Christian's identity with, incorporation with, the life and death of the Saviour. Christ's sufferings are set forth as producing their effect by the moral power of example, so that His life of suffering and obedience is as the *copy* over which we are to write, the *track* in which we are to walk; and so we are to be released from sin by the imitation of Christ.[3] "He that hath died," says St. Paul, "hath been justified from sin,"[4] meaning by this that he who by baptism (vi. 4) has been buried with Christ into His death, has also by baptism risen with Him into a new life of communion, in which God's righteousness has become man's justification. St. Paul means, in fact, all the deep truth which he sets forth mystically in Rom. vi. 1—15, and which he explains through the remainder of that chapter by more popular metaphors. Now, St. Peter, in words which are doubtless an echo of St. Paul's language, says that "he who hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;"[5] but the practical intellect of St. Peter had no resemblance to the deeper genius of St. Paul, and the meaning of *his* words, as developed in the following verses, is simply the truth that the suffering

[1] 1 Pet. iv. 13.

[2] As in Rom. viii. 13.

[3] See Rom. vi. 1; 1 Peter ii. 21, *Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἀκολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ*, with the context of these passages.

[4] Rom. vi. 7.

[5] 1 Pet. iv. 1.

life of the Christian has in it all the blessedness of trial; and that, just as the luxury and surfeit of heathen life (verse 3) is essentially a state of sin, so the trials borne by the Christian warrior who is armed with the mind of Christ, naturally put an end to the seductiveness of sin. St. Paul dwells most on deliverance from *guilt*, St. Peter on deliverance from *sin*. With St. Paul the death of Christ is the means of expiation; with St. Peter it is more prominently a motive of amendment. St. Paul, in Rom. vi. 1—15, writes like a profound theologian. St. Peter, in iv. 1—4, is using the simpler language of a practical Christian. The union between the Christian and the death of Christ, in St. Paul is an *inner* union. In St. Peter the connexion is more outward—a connexion which rather invites our obedience than modifies our inmost nature.[1]

ii. We shall see similar differences in the use of other words. *Faith*, for instance, is a prominent word with St. Peter,[2] but neither he nor any other writer of the New Testament uses it in that unique and transcendent sense which is peculiar to St. Paul. With St. Paul, as we have already seen, it comes to mean an absolute *oneness with Christ*.[3] St. Peter, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and like St. Clement, uses it as "the substance of things which are hoped for—the conviction of unseen realities."[4] It is, in fact, "a confidence in the promises of God."[5] It is hence

[1] See Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* ii. 300.

[2] 1 Pet. i. 5, φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως; 7; 9, τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν; 21; v. 9, στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει.

[3] See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 209. *seq.*

[4] 1 Pet. i. 8; Heb. xi. 1; Clem. *Ep. ad Cor.* xxvi., xxvii.; Pfleiderer, *Paulinism.* ii. 140.

[5] 1 Pet. i. 3, 13, iii. 15.

nearly allied to Hope. In the Epistle to the Romans the main object of faith is God's redeeming favour evidenced by Christ's death;[1] in St. Peter faith is mainly directed to the future salvation, of which Christ's resurrection is a pledge, and to which His sufferings are a means. And although St. Peter dwells so much on good works, that "to do good" (ἀγαθοποιεῖν) occurs no less than nine times in his Epistle,[2] yet he is not in the least endeavouring to prove any theory of Justification by works, but simply regards good works as St. Paul does, namely, as the natural issue of the Christian calling. Nor, when he speaks of *fear*, in i. 17,[3] is there intended to be any opposition to Rom. viii. 15,[4] any more than there is in 1 John iv. 18.[5] The "fear" spoken of by St. Peter is only a fear of falling away from grace. There is no contradiction between the Apostles, but there is a different gleam in their presentation of the "many-coloured wisdom"[6] of God.

iii. Again, we see a difference respecting *Regeneration* and *Baptism*, and here once more St. Peter's view is predominantly moral and general, St. Paul's is mystic and dogmatic. Regeneration with St. Paul means a new creation, the beginning of a life which is not the human and individual life, but which is "Christ in us." But St. Peter, like St. James, regards this new birth as produced by the living and abiding *word* of God, producing the purification which springs from obedience to the truth, and having as its objects a

[1] Rom. iv. 25.
[2] 1 Pet. ii. 14, 15, 20, iii. 6, 11, 13, 16, 17, iv. 19.
[3] "Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear."
[4] "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again to fear."
[5] "Perfect love casteth out fear."
[6] πολυποίκιλος σοφία.

living hope and a sincere brotherly love.[1] And whereas Baptism is, with St. Paul, the beginning of the new birth, and the communication of the Spirit, with St. Peter, on the other hand—whatever may be the exact meaning of the difficult expression which he uses[2]—it is clear that his thoughts are mainly fixed on the moral obligations which enter into baptism as being a type of our deliverance by means of the resurrection of Christ.

10. But while St. Peter brings down, as it were, the transcendental divinity of St. Paul from heaven to earth—from the regions of a sublime theology to those of practical Christian life—while the diversities of gifts imparted by the same Spirit thus meet the individual needs of every Christian—while the contemplation of truth from many different points of

[1] 1 Pet. i. 22, 23; Jas. i. 18.

[2] 1 Pet. iii. 21, ἐπερώτημα ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως εἰς Θεὸν. It has been taken to mean (1) "*pledge*," "contract" (ἀῤῥαβών, ἐνέχυρον, Œcum.; *stipulatio*, Luther), as Tertullian calls baptism *obligatio fidei, sponsio salutis, fidei pactio*, but this seems only to be a later Byzantine meaning of the word; or (2) "the *question and answer* of baptism"—the promise to renounce the devil, etc., and so to keep a good conscience ("*Anima non lavatione sed responsione sancitur*," Tert. *de Resurr. Carn.* 48)—but ἐπερώτημα cannot bear this sense; or (3) joining ἐπερώτημα with εἰς Θεὸν, and taking the phrase ἐπέρωτᾶν ἐς in 2 Kings xi. 7 as explaining it—"the inquiry after God of a good conscience;" or (4) "*request to God for a good conscience.*" Taking ἐπερώτημα in this its natural sense, (the sense it bears in the only passage of the LXX. in which it occurs, *vide* Dan. iv. 14,) I believe this last view to be correct; but if εἰς Θεὸν be taken with συνείδησις, as in Acts xxiv. 16, then it will be "the *entreaty for a good conscience towards God.*" This, indeed, may seem an inadequate explanation of the saving power of baptism, but so (at first sight) is every other sense which the words will at all bear; and when we remember the practical and non-mystical character of the Apostle's mind, much of the difficulty disappears, and the entreaty involves its own fulfilment. [The Revised Version renders the word "interrogation," and in the margin suggests the alternatives of "inquiry" or "appeal." Archbishop Leighton says, "The word intends the whole correspondence of the conscience with God. . . . The word is judicial, alluding to the interrogation used in law, etc."]

view enables us to understand its solidity and perfectness—St. Peter has one doctrine which is almost peculiar to himself, and which is inestimably precious. In this he not only ratifies some of the widest hopes which it had been given to his brother Apostle, if not to *reveal*, at least to *intimate*, but he also supplements these hopes by the new aspect of a much-disregarded, and, indeed, till recent times half-forgotten, article of the Christian creed;—I mean the object of Christ's descent into Hades.[1] In this truth is involved nothing less than the extension of Christ's redeeming work to the dead who died before His coming. Had the Epistle contained nothing else but this, it would at once have been raised above the irreverent charge of being "secondhand and commonplace."[2] I allude of course to the famous passage in which St. Peter tells us (iii. 19, 20) that "Christ died for sins once for all that He may lead us to God, slain indeed in the flesh but quickened in the Spirit, *in which also He went and preached to the spirits in prison, once disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was waiting,*[3] *in the days of Noah, during the preparing of the ark, by entering into which few, that is, eight souls, were brought safe through water.*"[4] So far is this from being a casual allusion, that St. Peter returns to it, as though with the object of making its meaning

[1] Minor original specialities are "into which things the angels desire to look" (i. 12); Christ, "the chief Shepherd" (v. 4); the presentation of Christ's *sufferings* as an example (ii. 21), etc. See Davidson, *Introd.* i. 423, and for peculiarities of phraseology, *id.* p. 433.

[2] Schwegler.

[3] Leg. ἀπεξεδέχετο.

[4] In my *Mercy and Judgment* (pp. 75—81) I have given (with original quotations) a full history of the exegesis of this passage in the Christian Church. What may be called the *mythological* inferences from it, apart from the blessed truth which it generally indicates, may be found in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus.

indisputably plain. When he speaks of the perishing heathen who shall, after lives of sin and self-indulgence, give account to the Judge of quick and dead, he says —"*For, for this cause also, even to the dead was the Gospel preached;*" adding, as though to preclude any escape from his plain meaning, "that they may be judged according to men in the flesh, but may live according to God in the spirit."[1] Few words of Scripture have been so tortured and emptied of their significance as these. In other passages whole theological systems, whole ecclesiastical despotisms, have been built on the abuse of a metaphor, on the translation of rhetoric into logic, on the ignorance and incapacity which will not interpret words by the universal rules of literary criticism; and yet every effort has been made to explain away the plain meaning of *this* passage. It is one of the most precious passages of Scripture, and it involves no ambiguity, except such as is created by the scholasticism of a prejudiced theology. It stands almost alone in Scripture, not indeed in the gleam of light which it throws across the awful darkness of the destiny of sin, but in the manner in which it reveals to us *the source* from which that gleam of light has been derived. For if language have any meaning, this language means that Christ, when His Spirit descended into the lower world, proclaimed the message of salvation to the once impenitent dead. In the first indeed of the two allusions to this truth the preaching is formally limited to those who had died in the Deluge. This is due to two causes. St. Peter's mind is full of the Deluge as a *type* of the world's lustration, first by death and then by deliverance, just as baptism is a type of death unto sin

[1] 1 Pet. iv. 6.

and the new life unto righteousness. Also he is thinking of Christ's comparison of the days of Noah to the days of the Son of Man. But it is impossible to suppose that the antediluvian sinners, conspicuous as they were for their wickedness, were the *only* ones of all the dead who were singled out to receive the message of deliverance. That restricted application is excluded by the *second* passage. There the Apostle shows that he had only referred to those who perished in the Deluge as *striking representatives* of a world of sinners, judged as regards men in the flesh, but living as regards God in the spirit. For, in referring to the judgment which awaits *the heathen*, he attempers the awful thought of their iniquities and of the future retribution which awaited them by saying that, with a view to this very state of things (εἰς τοῦτο) the Gospel was preached to the dead;—in order that, however terrible might be the judgments which would befall their human nature, the hope of some spiritual share in the divine life might not be for ever excluded at the moment of death. Of the *effects* of the preaching nothing is said. There is no dogma either of universalism or of conditional immortality. All details, as in the entire eschatology of Scripture, are left dim and indefinite; but no honest man who goes to Holy Scripture to *seek* for truth, instead of going to try and find whatever errors he may bring to it as a part of his theological belief, can possibly deny that there is ground here to mitigate that element of the popular teaching of Christendom against which many of the greatest saints and theologians have raised their voices.[1] That teaching rests with the deadliest weight on all who have sufficient imagination

[1] See *Mercy and Judgment*, pp. 16—57.

to realise the meaning of the phrases in which they indulge, and sufficient heart to feel their awfulness. If Christ *preached to dead men who were once disobedient*, then Scripture shows us that the moment of death does not necessarily involve a final and hopeless torment for every sinful soul. Of all the blunt weapons of ignorant controversy employed against those to whom has been revealed the possibility of a larger hope than is left to mankind by Augustine or by Calvin, the bluntest is the charge that such a hope renders null the necessity for the work of Christ! As if it were not this very hope which gives to the love of Christ its mightiest effectiveness! We thus rescue the work of redemption from the appearance of having failed to achieve its end for the vast majority of those for whom Christ died. By accepting the light thus thrown upon "the descent into Hell," we extend to those of the dead who have not finally hardened themselves against it the blessedness of Christ's atoning work. We thus complete the divine, all-comprehending circuit of God's universal grace! In these passages, as has been truly said, "we may see an expansive paraphrase and exuberant variation of the original Pauline theme of the universalism of the evangelic embassage of Christ and of His sovereignty over the world; and especially of the passage in the Philippians,[1] where all they that are in heaven and on the earth, and *under the earth*, are enumerated as classes of the subjects of the exalted Redeemer."

But alas! human perversity has darkened the very heavens by looking at them through the medium of its own preconceptions; and the clear light of

[1] Phil. ii. 9, 11.

revelation has streamed in vain upon the awfulness of the future. The attempts to make the descent of Jesus into Hades a visit merely to liberate the holy patriarchs, or to strike terror into the evil spirits, are the unworthy inventions of dogmatic embarrassment. The interpretation of Christ's "preaching" as only a preaching of damnation[1] is one of the most melancholy specimens of theological hardness trying to blot out the hope of God's mercy from the world beyond the grave. "It was," as Reuss says, "far better than all that: it was for the living a new manifestation of the inexhaustible grace of God; for the dead a supreme opportunity for casting themselves into the arms of His mercy; and finally, for Christian theologians, so skilful in torturing the letter, and so blind at seizing the spirit, it might have been the germ of a sublime and fruitful conception, if instead of compressing more and more the circle of life and light by their formulæ and their anathemas, they would have learnt from the teaching of the Apostle that this circle is illimitable, and that the life-giving rays which stream from its centre can penetrate even the most distant sphere of the world of spirits."

Having thus seen the authenticity, and the characteristics of the first Epistle of St. Peter, we may proceed to ask, What was its object? Clearly it was not meant as a system of theology. Some have supposed that its scope was *directly* conciliatory—that by borrowing alike from St. Paul and St. James, and

[1] It is needless to say that in the N. T. κηρύσσω has no such meaning, and the parallel passage, iv. 6, has εὐηγγελίσθη. See Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6.

endeavouring, as it were, to make them both speak with the same mouth,[1] St. Peter wished to calm the controversies which had arisen, and to show that the Christian faith, whether preached by Judaists or Paulinists, was essentially the same. Now there may have been in the mind of St. Peter some such undercurrent of intention. For he was addressing, among others, the Churches of Galatia, which had been the scene of burning controversies; and he may have wished by his silence about the Law, and his omission of such phrases as "Justification by Faith," to show that the essential truths of Christianity might be disengaged from polemical bitterness. There must have been something intentional in this silence, for no one can read the words of St. Paul in Gal. v. 13—

(1) "*For ye were called for freedom, brethren,*

(2) *Only not freedom as a handle for the flesh,*

(3) *But by love serve* (δουλεύετε) *one another.*"

side by side with those of St. Peter, in ii. 16—

(1) "*As free,*

(2) *And yet not using your freedom as a veil of baseness,*

(3) *But as slaves* (δοῦλοι) *of God,*"—

without seeing that the resemblance is more than accidental.[2] The identity of structure, the similarity of rhythm, the echo of the thought, prove decisively that St. Peter had read the Epistle to the Galatians. It could not, therefore, have been without deliberate purpose that, in addressing Galatians among others,

[1] Reuss, *La Théol. Chrét.* ii. 294.

[2] The quotation is further interesting as being made from an Epistle in which his own conduct is condemned.

he assumes, without the least controversial vehemence, the once-startling proposition that faithful Gentiles are the true Jews,[1] an elect race, a holy nation, the true heritage of God, and even the true priesthood,[2] while yet he says no word about Mosaism, or about the terms of communion between Jews and Gentiles. Here, again, we may recognise the exact attitude of Peter as seen in the Acts of the Apostles. He is a sincere and even a scrupulous Jew; yet he had been divinely taught that the practices which he might himself continue to adopt as matters of national obligation were in no sense binding on the Gentiles, and that their freedom did not place them in a lower position in the eyes of God, who is no respecter of persons. But though such thoughts may have been in his mind, they did not furnish the motive of his address, which was, as he himself says, essentially hortatory. He wrote to testify and to exhort;[3] to confirm the converts in the truths which they had already learnt from the missions of St. Paul and his companions, and to comfort them under persecution by encouragements, founded on the hopes of which they were partakers, and on the example and effect of the sufferings of Christ.

As in other instances, the question has been raised whether St. Peter intended to address Jews or Gentiles;—and, as in other instances, the true answer seems to be—neither class exclusively. The Dispersion of which he is mainly thinking is a spiritual one. He is writing

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 6.

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 5, οἶκος πνευματικὸς, ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον; 1 Pet. ii. 9, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα (*cf.* מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים, Ex. xix. 5, 6, and LXX.), κ.τ.λ. λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν סְגֻלָּה, *cf.* Acts xx. 28).

[3] 1 Pet. v. 12, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, κ.τ.λ.

to all Christians in the countries which he mentions.[1] Why he selected the Churches of Asia Minor, and did not include the Churches of Syria, Macedonia, and Achaia, is a question which we cannot solve, seeing that both in Greece and in Syria he was personally known. That he is addressing Gentiles *as well as* Jews cannot be doubted by any unconventional reader;[2] but he regards them as alike pilgrims and sojourners on earth, common members of the ideal Israel, common heirs of the heavenly inheritance.[3] Yet we need go no farther than the first line of his letter, with its two distinctively Jewish expressions of "sojourners" (*Toshabim*) and "the dispersion" (*Galootha*), to show that even to Gentiles he is writing with the feelings and habits of a Jew.

It seems likely that the Epistle was written after the final imprisonment of St. Paul, during whose activity St. Peter would hardly have written to any of the Churches which had been exclusively founded by the Apostle of the Gentiles. The condition of the Churches addressed accords well with such a supposition. He is

[1] Weiss, in the interests of his arbitrary theory that the letter is one of the earliest documents of Christianity, tries to prove that it was addressed exclusively to Jews. His arguments (*Petr. Lehrbegr.* 115, 116) are entirely inconclusive, and are sufficiently answered in the text. This view has, however, found many supporters in all ages, as Eusebius, Didymus, Jerome, Theophylact, and in modern times Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, etc.

[2] See 1 Pet. i. 14, 18, iii. 6, ii. 9, 10, iv. 3, 4. Many doubtless of these Gentiles had passed into the Church through the portals of the Synagogue. Hence they would find no difficulty in the casual allusions to the Old Testament (i. 15, 16, 23—25, ii. 6, 19, iii. 10, iv. 18, v. 5), which, as Immer remarks (*N. Test. Theol.*, p. 477), are not introduced with any Rabbinic refinements.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 1, iii. 6, v. 9 (*cf.* Heb. xi. 13; Phil. iii. 20; Gen. xlvii. 9; גר Ps. xxxix. 14); "*nachalath Jehovah*," Jos. xiii. 23, etc. Similarly, Clemens Romanus, though a Gentile, talks of "our father, Abraham."

waiting to those who, although their faith was undergoing a severe test like gold tried in the fire,[1] were yet mainly liable to danger rather than to death. They were exposed to false accusation as malefactors,[2] to revilings,[3] threats,[4] and a general system of terrorism and suffering.[5] Now this is exactly the state of things which must have existed in the provinces after the Neronian persecution. That crisis marked out the Christians for a special hatred above and beyond what they experienced as being, in the eyes of the world, a debased Jewish sect. It even brought into prominence that name of "Christians," which, though invented by the jeering populace of Antioch as early as A.D. 44, had not until this time come into general vogue.[6] It is true that Orosius[7] is the first writer who asserts that the persecution extended "through all the provinces," and there is no authority for the assertion of Tertullian that Nero had made the repression of Christians a standing law of the Empire.[8] Some have attempted to prove that the

[1] 1 Pet. i. 7, iv. 12.

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 12, 15.

[3] 1 Pet. ii. 23, iii. 9, iv. 14.

[4] 1 Pet. iii. 16, ἐπηρεάζοντες.

[5] 1 Pet. iii. 9, 14, 17, iv. 15, 19. Tacitus counts Christianity among the shameful things (*pudenda*) which flowed Romewards (comp. Rom. i. 16).

[6] See my *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 298. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) uses the word "*Christianos*" with something of an apology. It is well known that in the N. T. it only occurs three times, and always involves a hostile sense (Acts xi. 26, xxvi. 28), as it does in iv. 16.

[7] Oros. vii. 11, "*per omnes provincias* pari persecutione cruciari imperavit." The Lusitanian inscription (Gruter, p. 238; Orelli, 730), which thanks Nero for purging the province of some foreign superstition (novam humano generi superstitionem), is now given up. See Merivale, i. 450; Gieseler, i. 28.

[8] *Ad Natt.* i. 7, "sub Nerone damnatio invaluit." In the martyrologies, we read of martyrs during the Neronian persecution at Milan, Aquileia, Carthage, etc.; and St. John mentions the martyr Antipas by name, at Pergamum (Rev. ii. 13), besides alluding to others (Rev. xvi. 5).

state of things referred to could only have existed during the persecution of Trajan (A.D. 101),[1] which is of course equivalent to saying that the Epistle is spurious. But considering that we find the traces of trials at least as severe as those to which St. Peter alludes some time *before* the Neronian persecution had broken out,[2] and in the Apocalyptic letters to the seven Churches of Asia *after* it had broken out,[3] the whole argument is groundless. The members of a sect which was "everywhere spoken against," and for which even the worthiest Gentile writers can find no better epithet than "execrable"—a sect which from the first was supposed to involve a necessary connection with the deadliest crimes[4]—a sect which from the earliest days seems to have been exposed to the insults of the vilest mural caricatures[5]—were certainly as liable in the later years of Nero as they were in the days of Trajan to suffer such troubles as those to which St. Peter alludes.[6] It ought to have been regarded as decisive

[1] See especially Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeit. II.* 2—29; Köstlin, *Johann-Lehrbegr.* 472—481; Baur, *First Three Centuries*, i. 133.

[2] For instance, in 1 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 4; 2 Thess. i. 4, iii. 2; Phil. i. 28, 30, etc.

[3] Rev. i. 9, ii. 9, 10, 13, vi. 9, 11, xviii. 24, xx. 4.

[4] Plin. *Ep.* x. 97, "flagitia cohaerentia nomini;" Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44, "quos, per *flagitia* invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat."

[5] A celebrated graffito of the Palatine, representing an ass on a cross, has been supposed to be a mockery of the Crucifixion. It was found in 1856, and is now in the library of the Collegio Romano. P. Garucci supposes that it was drawn towards the close of the second century. Similar insults to Christians have been found on various gems and wall-inscriptions at Pompeii, etc. See Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, p. 40. Merivale, *Hist.* vi. 442. These graffiti and calumnies are alluded to by Tertullian, *Apol.* 16; *ad Natt.* i. 11; Minuc. Felix, *Octav.* ix. 28; Celsus, *ap.* Orig. *c. Cels.* vi. 31.

[6] Renan rightly says, "L'épître de Pierre répond bien à ce que nous savons, surtout par Tacite, de la situation des Chrétiens à Rome vers l'an 63 ou 64" (*L'Antéchrist*, p. xi.).

against the later date thus suggested for the Epistle, that, like all the Epistles in the New Testament, it is anterior to that rapid development of the power of the Episcopate which is so prominent in the earliest of the extra-canonical writings. The Churches of the Spiritual Dispersion are still under the government of Presbyters, and St. Peter addresses them as their "fellow-presbyter." The word "*episkopos*" occurs but once in his letter, and that in its purely general and untechnical signification.[1] Hence the letter is addressed to the converts in general, with only a special message to Presbyters at the end. *Hope* is the keynote of this Epistle. Its main message is, *Endure, submit, for you are heirs of salvation.*[2]

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 25, to the Bishop (or Overseer) of your souls.

[2] The letter falls, like most of St. Paul's letters (see *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 605, 606), into two great divisions—doctrinal and practical. I. i. 1—ii. 10, the *blessings* of Christians. II. ii. 11—v. 14, the *duties* of Christians. More in detail the outline of the letter is as follows:—(I.) Greeting (i. 1, 2); thanksgiving, intended to console the readers with the living Hope of that future inheritance on which, through God's mercy and Christ's resurrection, they should enter after their brief sorrows on earth—that salvation, to which all prophecy pointed, and into which angels desire to look (i. 3—12); exhortation (α) *to holy living* in hope and obedience (i. 13—17), founded on the price paid for their redemption (18—21); (β) *to brotherly love*, founded on their new birth by the eternal word of God (22—25); *and* (γ) *to Christian innocence*, as babes desiring spiritual milk, and as living stones of a spiritual house (ii. 1—10). Then (II.), after a special entreaty to them to abstain from fleshly desires, so as to win their heathen neighbours to glorify God by seeing their honourable mode of life—an entreaty specially applicable to a period when "Christian" was regarded as a synonym of "malefactor" (11, 12), he passes to a second series of exhortations, which have direct reference to the trials by which they are surrounded (ii. 13—iii. 7): namely, to the spirit of submission (α) *generally* (ii. 13—17); (β) in the position of *servants* (18—20) bearing in mind the meek example of Christ their Redeemer (21—25); (γ) in the position of *Christian women*, who, in meek simplicity, are to imitate Sarah, their spiritual ancestress (iii. 1—6), and (δ) of Christian *husbands* (7). Then follows a *third* series of exhortations (iii. 8—iv. 19), (α) to forgiveness and peaceful self-control as in God's sight (iii. 8—12); (β) to calm endurance

of wrongful suffering—again with reference to the example of Christ (13—18), who preached even in Hades to those who were once disobedient (in the days of that deluge from which Noah and his family were saved as we are saved by baptism)—but who is now exalted at God's right hand (19—22); (γ) to the abandonment of the old heathen life, which would bring inevitable judgment (iv. 1—6); (δ) to sobriety, love, hospitality, a right use of gifts, that God may be glorified (7—10); (ε) to the cheerful, innocent, even thankful endurance of sorrow as a normal part of the Christian life (11—16), and one in which, being far less to be pitied than the unfaithful, they might safely entrust their souls to God (17—19). Then follow special exhortations (α) to Presbyters (v. 1—4); (β) to younger members of the Church (5—7); and (γ) to all alike, to watch and strive (9, 10). The Epistle ends with a blessing (10, 11) and a few parting words about Silvanus and the letter of which he is the bearer (12), and greetings (13, 14).

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

Ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς.—LUKE xxii. 32.

"Habet haec epistola τὸ σφοδρὸν conveniens ingenio principis apostolorum."—GROTIUS.

"Mirabilis est gravitas et alacritas Petrini sermonis, lectorem suavissime retinens."—BENGEL.

"PETER, an Apostle of Jesus Christ"—such is the simple and authoritative designation which he adopts. He does not need to add any of the amplifications of his title, or assertions of his claim to it, which were often necessary to St. Paul, whose Apostolic authority had been so fiercely questioned. Nor does he need to adopt St. Paul's practice of associating the names of his companions with his own, although both Mark and Silvanus, so well known to the Asian Churches, were at this time with him in Rome. His dignity as an Apostle was unquestioned. His words needed no further weight than they derived from his acknowledged position. It is not insignificant that he uses the name which Christ had given him, and uses it in its Greek, not its Aramaic, form. Had he been writing with any *exclusive* reference to the Jewish Christians, it is more probable that he would have used his own name, Symeon, by which James speaks of him to the Church of Jerusalem, or the Aramaic "Kephas," by which St. Paul designates him, because

he was so called by the Judaists of Galatia and Corinth.[1]

"To the elect sojourners of the Dispersion of Pontus,[2] Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The Dispersion—in Greek, *Diaspora;* in Aramaic, *Galootha*—was no doubt an essentially literal and geographical expression; but as St. Peter uses the unusual word "sojourners" (*parepidemoi*) in a metaphorical sense for "pilgrims" in ii. 11,[3] he probably uses it in the same sense here, and not in its narrower sense of scattered Jews. The Churches which he was addressing were composed of Jewish and Gentile converts. Many of the latter had doubtless been proselytes. Even those who had been converted direct from heathenism would have been made familiar from the first with the existence of the Old Testament, and with the truth which St. Paul had so powerfully established in his letter to the Galatians, that the converted Gentiles constituted the ideal Israel. Nothing, therefore, is more natural in a Jewish writer than the half-literal, half-metaphorical expression, "the expatriated elect of the Dispersion." The word "elect" marks them out as Christians, being one of the terms by which Christians used to define themselves.[4] Many of them, being Jews by birth, were literal members of "the Dispersion;" all of them were strangers upon earth, exiles from heaven their home, dwelling in Mesech and

[1] That he wrote in Greek is certain from the style, which is far too animated to be a translation. It is a most narrow view which assumes that St. Peter could not address Gentiles without violating what is called "the Apostolic compact" (Gal. ii. 9).

[2] Hence sometimes known as the Epistle *ad Ponticos* (Tert. *Scorp.* 12).

[3] Ps. xxxix. 13, cxx. 5. Cf. Heb. xi. 13; Judith v. 18; 2 Macc. i. 27. Comp. John xi. 52, and πάροικος in Acts vii. 6, 29.

[4] 1 Thess. i. 4.

amid the tents of Kedar. It is natural that the phrases of a Jewish writer should be predominantly Jewish. Even the language of St. Paul, cosmopolitan as were his views, is largely coloured by theocratic images and metaphors belonging to the older dispensation.[1]

There seems to be no traceable significance in the order in which the provinces of Asia Minor—to use a convenient later term—are mentioned. Writing from Rome, he begins with the most distant, Pontus, flinging as it were to its farthest cast the net of the fisher of men. The order of the rest, from north-east to south and west, must be due to some subjective accident. The Churches of two of the provinces, Galatia and Asia[2]—including some so important as Ancyra, Tavium, Pessinus, and the famous Seven Churches—had been founded by St. Paul or his companions. Jews of Pontus and Cappadocia had been present at the great discourse of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost,[3] and these districts contained, among others, such wealthy towns as Tyana, Nyssa, Cæsarea, and Nazianzus. The Churches of Bithynia, which St. Paul had been hindered from visiting by a Divine intimation, were forerunners of the communities to whose simplicity and faithfulness, forty years later, Pliny bore his impartial and memorable testimony in his letter to the Emperor Trajan.

Having thus named the converts whom he meant specially to address, he describes their election as due in its *origin* "to the foreknowledge of God the Father,"

[1] The Galatian Churches, for instance, were largely composed of Gentiles, yet St. Paul's arguments to them are of a Judaic and sometimes even of a Rabbinic character.

[2] Proconsular Asia, which included Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia.

[3] Acts ii. 9. Cf. Jos. *Antt.* xvi. 6.

in its *progress* "to the sanctifying work of the Spirit," and as having for its *end* "obedience, and sprinkling by the blood of Jesus Christ."[1] Thus, no less than St. Paul, he describes each of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity as co-operant in the work of man's salvation. In his salutation, "Grace unto you and peace," he follows St. Paul in the comprehensive formula by which he unites the Hellenic greeting of "*joy*," with the Hebrew greeting of "*peace*"—both of them used in their deeper Christian sense,[2] of a "peace" which passeth understanding, and a "joy" which the world could neither give nor take away. From the Book of Daniel, with which he was evidently familiar, he adopts the expression "*be multiplied*," which is found in the letters of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar there recorded[3] (i. 1–3).

Then follows the rich and full thanksgiving, with its comprehensive glance at the future (3—5), the present (6—9), and the past (10—12):—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,[4] Who, according to His great mercy, begat us again[5] to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ

[1] *ῥαντισμόν*, Heb. xii. 24, "Sprinkling," *i.e.*, "Your being sprinkled." The allusion is to the sprinkling of the *people* at the inauguration of the Mosaic Covenant (Ex. xxiv. 8); but there may be also the conception of purifying, as the vessels of the sanctuary were purified by sprinkled blood. Cf. Heb. ix. 13, 18—28; Ex. xxiv. 6—8; Lev. xvi. 14 and 19, etc. Any allusion to the Lord's Supper, which Weiss (*Petr. Lehrbegr.* 273) assumes as certain, is more than doubtful.

[2] See my *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 580.

[3] Dan. iii. 31, iv. 1, vi. 25, whence the Rabbis probably derived it (Wetst. *ad Cor.*). Cf. Jude 2; 2 Pet. i. 2.

[4] Cf. Eph. i. 3.

[5] Ἀναγεννήσας, a word peculiar to St. Peter. But compare ἀπεκύησεν, James i. 18; γεννᾶσθαι ἄνωθεν, James iii. 3; παλιγγενεσία, Tit. iii. 5; κτισθέντες ἐν Χρ. Ἰησοῦ, Eph. ii. 10.

from the dead,[1] to an inheritance incorruptible and stainless and unwithering,[2] which has been reserved in heaven for you,[3]—who by the power of God are being guarded[4] by faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed[5] at the last season. In which thought ye exult,[6] though for a little while at present, if need be, ye have been grieved in various trials, that the tested genuineness of your faith—a far costlier thing than gold which perisheth, and yet is tested by means of fire[7]—might prove to be for (your) praise and honour and glory[8] at the revelation of Jesus Christ; Whom though ye never saw ye love;[9] on Whom—though ye still see Him not—yet believing, ye exult with joy inexpressible and glorified; carrying off as a prize[10] the end of your

[1] Here he strikes the key-note of the Epistle, *Hope founded on the Resurrection*; not a *dead*, but an *energising* Hope, such as the Resurrection had wrought in the Apostles by dispelling their despair; a Hope living, life-giving, and looking to life (De Wette) of which the Resurrection was "not only the exemplar, but the efficient cause" (Leighton).

[2] Εἰς. The Hope will end in the fruition of heritage, which is salvation and glory (1 Pet. i. 5, v. 1); ἀμαράντος (Wisd. vi. 12) not the same as ἀμαράντινος in v. 4.

[3] And therefore beyond the reach of danger.

[4] "*Haereditas servata est, haeredes custodiuntur*" (Bengel). Cf. Phil. iv. 7. The MSS. throughout the Epistle vary between "us" and "you," as is so often the case. Here, as in almost every instance, ὑμᾶς is the right reading (א, A, B, C, K, L, etc.), though the E. V. usually adopts "us" and "we." The "you" is characteristic of the Apostolic authority of the teacher.

[5] Draw the curtain at the last time (Jud. 18), and the salvation is already there, behind the veil. See 1 Pet. iv. 5, 7.

[6] Here he passes from the future to the *present*. The "salvation" in its completeness is future, the "exultation" (a word characteristically Petrine; cf. 1 Pet. i. 8, iv. 13; Matt. v. 12) is present, and the epithets applied to it are anticipatory only in their *fulness*.

[7] Hermas, *Pastor*, i. 4, p. 440; ed. Dressel.

[8] "Well done, good and faithful servant!" (Matt. xxv. 21).

[9] John xx. 29.

[10] The prize is carried off by anticipation now; in reality hereafter. It is "glory begun below." "The moods of the New Testament converge towards the present."

faith—the salvation of souls.[1] Respecting which salvation the prophets diligently sought and searched, who prophesied concerning the grace which was coming to you;—searching as to what or what kind of season the spirit of Christ in them[2] was indicating, when it testified beforehand the sufferings which were to fall upon Christ,[3] and the glories that should follow them; to whom it was revealed that not [mainly] for themselves,[4] but for you they were ministering these things,[5] which have now been proclaimed to you[6] by means of those who preached to you the Gospel by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven;[7] into which things angels desire to stoop and look."[8]

"Therefore, girding up at once the loins of your understanding,[9] being sober, lean with perfect hope

[1] 1 Pet. i. 6—9. The "salvation" is not from the sorrows and trials of life, but from all sin.

[2] The remark in the Ep. of Barnabas (*cap.* v.) still remains the best comment on this expression, "The prophets, having their gift from Him, prophesied about Him." St. Peter was not likely to enter into such scholastic refinements as those which separate the idea of "Christ" from that of "the Eternal Son."

[3] 1 Pet. i. 11, τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα.

[4] "As little children lisp and talk of Heaven,
So thoughts *beyond their thoughts* to those high bards were given."
KEBLE.

I insert the word "mainly" after "not" in accordance with a well-known idiom.

[5] See Acts ii. 17, 31, iii. 24.

[6] "You" and "ye" (not "us" and "we," as in the E. V.) are the best authorised readings throughout the Epistle, except in i. 3, iv. 17, and ii. 24 (from Isaiah). This seems to have been St. Peter's method (Acts xv. 7).

[7] Mark the emphatic testimony to the teaching of St. Paul, by whom, directly or indirectly, most of these Churches had been founded.

[8] 1 Pet. i. 10—12. For the word παρακύψαι see James i. 25; Luke xxiv. 12; John xx. 5, 11. Cf. Heb. ii. 16.

[9] Luke xii. 25; Eph. vi. 14.

upon the grace that is being borne to you in the revelation of Jesus Christ; as children of obedience,[1] not fashioning yourselves in conformity[2] with the former desires in your day of ignorance."[3]

This pregnant exhortation is supported by the motives, (i.) of God's holiness (15, 16); (ii.) of the fear due to Him as a Father and impartial Judge (17);[4] and (iii.) of the fact that they were ransomed from their empty traditional mode of life, not by mere corruptible silver and gold,[5] but by costly blood, as of a lamb blameless and spotless, even of Christ;[6] Who was pre-ordained before the world was, but has been manifested at the end of the time[7] for the sake of them who through Him believe on God, who raised Him from the dead, and gave Him glory, so that our faith is also hope towards God.[8]

The exhortation to Hope founded on these motives is followed by an exhortation to sincere and intense Love, as the natural result of the purification of the soul

[1] Cf. τέκνα ὀργῆς, Eph. ii. 3; φωτός, v. 8; κατάρας, 2 Pet. ii. 14.

[2] συσχηματιζόμενοι, Rom. xii. 2.

[3] "Ignorance;" cf. Rom. i. 18; Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30.

[4] εἰ Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε—"If ye call on Him as 'Father,' Who," etc. Perhaps with reference to the Lord's Prayer. In these verses notice ἀναστροφὴ, "mode of life," "conversation" in its old sense, used also to render πολίτευμα, "citizenship," in Phil. i. 27. The adv. ἀπροσωπολήπτως occurs here only, but the conception is thoroughly Petrine (Acts x. 34). The "fear" here recommended is not the fear reprobated in 1 John iv. 18; Rom. viii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 7, but "godly fear," φόβος τελειωτικὸς, awful reverence mixed with love, which "drowns all lower fears, and begets true fortitude" (Leighton).

[5] Notice the Petrine contempt for dross (Acts iii. 6, viii. 20).

[6] With special allusion to the deliverance secured by the Paschal Lamb (Ex. xii. 36); general reference to the whiteness and harmlessness of the Lamb. See *Life of Christ*, i. 143.

[7] 1 Pet. i. 20, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων, אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (Gen. xlix. 1).

[8] Or, "so that your faith and hope are in God," who raised Christ from the dead, etc. Acts ii. 22 (i. 13—21).

by the Holy Spirit[1] in the path of obedience; and of that new birth—not by human engendering, but by means of the living word (λόγος) of God, which is not transient, as is the flower of human life,[2] but is an utterance (ῥῆμα) which abideth for ever—"And this is the utterance preached to you as the Gospel."[3]

This is the starting-point to fresh exhortations. There were evidently divisions between the members of the Churches, which led St. Peter to impress on them the duty of fervent love. He proceeds to urge them to lay aside,[4] like some stained robe, all that is ruinous to brotherly union—malice, guile, insincerities, envies, backbitings, which may easily have arisen from such conditions as we have seen existing in the Churches of Galatia.[5] Born again, let them, as new-born babes, desire to be nurtured into perfect growth by the unadulterated spiritual milk,[6] since they knew by tasting that the Lord is sweet.[7] And then, changing the metaphor,[8] he bids them "come to Christ,[9] a living stone, and be built upon Him—as living stones upon a

[1] Cf. Acts xv. 9, where, however, the verb is καθαρίζω, not ἁγνίζω, as here and in James iv. 8; 1 John iii. 3. (See John xi. 55; Acts xxi. 24.)

[2] ἐξηράνθη . . . ἐξέπεσεν, gnomic aorists—*i.e.*, aorists expressive of a general fact. See my Brief Greek Syntax, § 154.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 22—25. The "Logos" of this passage, if it has not yet risen to its Johannine sense, hovers on the verge of it, as in Heb. iv. 12.

[4] 'Αποθέμενοι, 1 Pet. ii. 1.

[5] See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 129, *seq.*

[6] τὸ λογικὸν (Rom. xii. 1), ἄδολον (1 Pet. ii. 2), γάλα (2 Cor. iv. 2).

Ps. xxxiv. 8, Χρηστὸς, "sweet" (Aug. *dulcis*, Vulg. *suavis*). Cf. Luke v. 39, vi. 35. Some have supposed a pleasant play of words, founded on itacism, between *chrestos* (sweet) and *Christos* (Christ). See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 301.

[8] There is the same sequence of the same metaphors in 1 Cor. iii. 1, 10.

[9] "Come (προσέρχεσθαι) as true proselytes (προσήλυτοι)." Though St. Peter here uses *lithos*, "stone," not *petra*, he is perhaps thinking of the great promise to himself (Matt. xvi. 18).

corner-stone—into a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up[1] spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."[2] The rejection of that precious stone by men, and its choice by God had long been prophesied.[3] The preciousness of it should belong to those who believed on Him;[4] to the others—"for which they were also appointed"—He should be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.[5] "But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood,[6] a holy nation, a people for special possession,[7] in order that ye may proclaim the excellence[8] of Him Who called you from darkness into His marvellous light: once not a people, but now a people of God; once uncompassionated, but compassionated now."[9]

Having thus laid the sure foundations of Hope and Comfort in the great doctrinal truths of Christianity,

[1] *ἀνενέγκαι*, "to offer once for all" (aor.), Rom. xii. 1.

[2] Heb. xiii. 15.

[3] Is. xxviii. 16. This citation, divergent from the LXX. in the two same particulars ("I lay in Sion" and "on Him") as in Rom. ix. 33, is a striking instance of the use of that Epistle by St. Peter; *ἀκρογωνιαῖον* (Eph. ii. 20).

[4] *ἡ τιμή*, 1 Pet. ii. 7, rendered in E. V. "he is precious." "The honour" is that involved in the *ἔντιμον*, "honourable" (E. V., "precious"), of the previous verse. For the O. T. reference see Ps. cxviii. 22; Is. viii. 14. (Heb. and Rom. ix. 33.)

[5] See Ps. cxviii. 22; Is. viii. 14; Luke xx. 17, 18; Rom. ix. 32, 33; Matt. xvi. 23. The allusion is to the course of God's earthly dealings, *e.g.*, as Roos says, "If Caiaphas, Judas, etc., had been born in a different century, they could not have acted as they did." There is no decree of reprobation, nor is the future world even alluded to, in *εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν*. See Acts i. 16. On the whole subject see *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 242—244, 590.

[6] Ex. xix. 6, LXX.

[7] *εἰς περιποίησιν* (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; Rev. i. 6; Acts xx. 28); עַם סְגֻלָּה (Is. xliii. 21; Ex. xx. 5).

[8] *ἀρετὰς* (a rare word, 2 Pet. i. 3), Is. xliii. 20, LXX.; in Hebr., תְּהִלָּתִי, "my praise" (Is. xlviii. 9).

[9] 1 Pet. ii. 1—10. Lo Ammi and Lo Ruhamah (Hos. ii. 23; Rom. ix. 25).

he devotes the rest of the Epistle to the enforcement of the moral duties which result from our Christian profession.

(1) First comes the appeal *to live purely and blamelessly.*

"Beloved! I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims to abstain from the carnal desires which make war against the soul,[1] keeping fair your mode of life[2] among the Gentiles, that, in the matter in which they speak against you as malefactors,[3] they may, in consequence of your fair deeds, as they witness them, glorify God in the day of visitation."[4]

(2) A second special duty of Christians in those days was *due respect, in all things lawful, to the civil government.* By Messianic exultation, by eschatological enthusiasms, by the sense of the glory and the dignity of redeemed manhood, by the revealed equality of all men in the sight of Him Who is no respecter of persons, by the conviction of the dwindling littleness of human distinctions in the light of eternal life, they might, if

[1] Jas. iv. 1; Rom. vii. 23.

[2] ἀναστροφή and ἀναστρέφεσθαι occur ten times in 1 and 2 Pet.

[3] At first the Christians were mainly charged with turbulence, moroseness, "*incivisme*," detestable superstition (Tacitus and Suetonius), and hard obstinacy (Pliny and Marcus Aurelius). The charges of infant murder, cannibalism, and gross immorality (Tert. *Apol.* 16, etc.) belong to a later age, when the Lord's Supper and the Agapae were misunderstood, and, perhaps, when Gnostic sects had really fallen into vile Antinomianism.

[4] 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12. "Day of visitation," when God comes to offer mercy (Gen. l. 24; Wisd. iii. 7; Luke i. 68, xix. 44), or to judge (Is. x. 3); not "when the heathen make judicial inquiry into your conduct" (Œcumen., Bengel, etc.), nor "on the Judgment Day" (Bede). Notice the large-hearted absence of any spirit of revenge. He only desires that the heathen, when they find how base were their calumnies, how cruel their conduct, may be led to glorify God! No anathemas here. Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan (*Ep.* x. 93) is the best comment on this passage.

they were not warned, be naturally tempted to a demeanour which would seem contemptuous towards earthly authority. Nay, more; the fearful spectacle of the power of the world wielded by those who were but too manifest servants of the power of darkness—the sight of Antichrist seated in his infamy upon the world's throne—the daily proof of odious wickedness in high places—the constant expectation of that archangelic trumpet which would shatter the solid globe, and of that flaming epiphany which should destroy the enemies of Christ—might lead them into defiant words and contumacious actions. Occasions there are—and none knew this better than an Apostle who had himself set an example of splendid disobedience to unwarranted commands[1]—when "we must obey God rather than men." But those occasions are exceptional to the common rule of life. Normally, and as a whole, human law is on the side of divine order, and, by whomsoever administered, has a just claim to obedience and respect. It was a lesson so deeply needed by the Christians of the day that it is taught as emphatically by St. John[2] and by St. Peter as by St. Paul himself.[3] It was more than ever needed at a time when dangerous revolts were gathering to a head in Judæa; when the hearts of Jews throughout the world were burning with a fierce flame of hatred against the abominations of a tyrannous idolatry; when Christians were being charged with "turning the world upside-down;"[4] when some poor Christian slave led to

[1] Acts iii. 19, 31, v. 28—32, 40—42.

[2] John xix. 11.

[3] And yet Volkmar sees in St. Paul the False Prophet of the Apocalypse, mainly because he taught that "the powers that be are ordained of God"!

[4] Acts xvii. 6.

martyrdom or put to the torture might easily relieve the tension of his soul by bursting into Apocalyptic denunciations of sudden doom against the crimes of the mystic Babylon; when the heathen, in their impatient contempt, might wilfully interpret a prophecy of the Final Conflagration as though it were a revolutionary and incendiary threat; and when Christians at Rome were, on this very account, already suffering the agonies of the Neronian persecution.[1]

Submission, therefore, was at this time a primary duty of all who wished to win over the Heathen, and to save the Church from being overwhelmed in some outburst of indignation which would be justified even to reasonable and tolerant Pagans as a political necessity. Nor does St. Peter think it needful to lay down exceptions to his general rule. In his days the letter of Scripture had not yet been turned into a weapon wherewith on every possible occasion to murder its spirit. He could not have anticipated in even the humblest Christian convert that dull literalism which in later ages was to derive from such passages the slavish doctrine of "passive obedience." He felt no apprehension that an unreasoning fetish-worship would fail to see that "texts" of Scripture are to be interpreted, not as rigid and exclusive legal documents, but in accordance with the general tenor of revelation. He was writing to Christians who had not yet invented a dogma about "verbal dictation," which necessitated ingenious casuistry on the one hand, or unreasonable folly on the other, and which turned both into a deadly engine of irresponsible tyranny.

[1] Tertullian and other apologists were greatly aided in their appeals to heathen clemency by referring to such passages as this. See Tert. *Apol.* 29—34.

"Submit, therefore," the Apostle says, "to every human ordinance,[1] for the Lord's sake, whether to the Emperor as supreme,[2] or to governors,[3] as missioned by him for punishment of malefactors and praise to well-doers; for this is the will of God, that by your well-doing ye should gag[4] the stolid ignorance of foolish persons; as free, yet not using your freedom for a cloak of baseness,[5] but as slaves of God. Honour all men," as a principle; and as your habitual practice,[6] "love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king."[7]

(3) These being the general rules, he applies them first *to domestics*,[8] whether slaves or freemen, bidding them with all fear to be submissive, not only to kindly but even to perverse masters, and that as a matter of conscience[9] even in cases of unjust suffering. "For what kind of glory is it if doing wrong and being buffeted ye shall bear it? but if doing well and suffering ye shall bear it, this is thankworthy with God.[10] For to this

[1] *κτίσιν*, lit. "creature." *τὰς ἀρχὰς λέγει τὰς χειροτονητὰς ὑπὸ τῶν Βασιλέων, κ.τ.λ.* (Œcumen.).

[2] The name "king" was freely used of the Emperor in the Provinces.

[3] Proconsuls, Procurators, Legates, Proprætors, etc.

[4] *φιμοῦν*, Deut. xxv. 4, and in the Gospels.

[5] "License they mean when they cry Liberty" (Milton). Calvin speaks of some who "reckoned it a great part of Christian liberty that they might eat flesh on Fridays"!

[6] The first verb is an aor., *τιμήσατε*. The others are presents, to imply continuance. "All men," see Acts x. 28.

[7] 1 Pet. ii. 13—17.

[8] *οἰκέται*. The prominence given to this class shows how numerous they were in the early Church, and is an additional proof that St. Peter must be addressing Gentiles as well as Jews. The Jews were rarely slaves, because their religion rendered them almost useless to heathen masters.

[9] Some would here render *συνειδήσεως*, *consciousness*, or cognisance of God (*mitwissen*, not *erwissen*). Cf. Col. iii. 23.

[10] *χάρις*, as in Luke vi. 32. Cf. מָצָא חֵן, Gen. vi. 8.

ye were called, because Christ too"—Who was also "a servant"[1]—" suffered on your behalf, leaving you a copy,[2] that ye may follow in His track; Who did no sin, nor was guile found in His mouth; Who being reviled reviled not again, suffering threatened not, but gave up[3] to Him Who judgeth righteously;[4] Who Himself carried up our sins in His own body on to the tree,[5] that becoming separated from our sins[6] we should live to righteousness; by Whose bruise we were healed.[7] For ye were as wandering sheep, but ye are now returned to the shepherd and guardian of your souls."[8]

(4) But a word was also necessary on the subject of social as well as political submission. *Christian wives* married to heathen husbands might be led to treat them as inferior to themselves. The elevation of their

[1] Is. liii. 9; Acts iii. 13.

[2] ὑπογραμμὸς—the letters over which children write. (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 8—50.)

[3] παρεδίδου δὲ. The subject is not expressed, but probably the verb has a quasi-middle sense—"entrusted Himself and His cause."

[4] Luke xxiii. 46. The Vulg. reads "injuste," so that there seems to have been a reading ἀδίκως—referring to Christ's submission to Pilate.

[5] I do not think that "He bore" (ἀνήνεγκεν, *tulit et obtulit*) can here have its sacrificial sense (which it has in James ii. 21, Heb. ix. 28, and in the LXX.). Christ is, indeed, the High Priest, and the Cross may be metaphorically described as the Altar (Heb. xiii. 10). But in what possible sense can "sins" be called a sacrifice? The only way to save this sense of ἀνήνεγκεν is to connect ἁμαρτίας very closely with ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, making the *sacrifice* His own body, in which He bare our sins (Is. liii. 12): "Ita tulisse peccata nostra ut ea secum obtulerit in altari "(Vitringa). But ἀναφέρω often has its ordinary sense in the New Testament (Mark ix. 2; Luke xxiv. 51, etc.), and there is no sacrificial sense in the verbs *sabal* and *nasa* of Is. liii. 11, 12. The use of the word "tree" (ξύλον) for "cross" is Hebraic (Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13).

[6] ἀπογενόμενοι. This is, however, sometimes an euphemism for "being dead," Hdt. ii. 85 (cf. Rom. vi. 2). "Righteousness is one; sin is manifold."

[7] Is. liii. 5, μώλωπι, "weal."

[8] 1 Pet. ii. 18—25, ἐπίσκοπος. Cf. Ez. xxxiv. 11. Hitherto they had been the other sheep, not of this fold (John x. 16).

whole sex by the principles of the new revelation might tempt them to extravagances of ornament or demeanour. To them therefore St. Peter extends his exhortations, that, even if (to suppose the worst) any of them be married to heathens who obey not the Word (*i.e.*, the Gospel), they may without word[1] (*i.e.*, by the eloquent silence of deeds) be won by the chaste humility, the "delicate, timorous grace," of wives whose adornment should not consist in elaborately braided hair,[2] golden jewels, or splendid robes, but in the inner soul,[3] in "the incorruptibleness of the meek and quiet spirit, which is in God's sight very precious." It was thus that the holy women of old, hoping Godwards, adorned themselves, submissive to their husbands as Sarah was,[4] whose spiritual children they would prove themselves to be by calm and equable well-doing, and by not living in a state of nervous scare.[5] Christian *husbands* too are to be gentle and considerate to their fellow-heirs of salvation, that no jarring discords might cut short their prayers.[6] What we have said in the first

[1] An interesting *antanaclasis* or intentional variation of meaning, in the use of λόγος which the E. V. has missed. The Christian woman was not to be a preacher in her own house.

[2] 1 Tim. ii. 9. Coins and allusions show how elaborate in this period was the adornment of the hair among women of the world; how many were their jewels, and how extravagant their robes. See *supra*, p. 5.

[3] "The hidden man of the heart"—a striking expression independently borrowed in a different sense (for St. Peter never alludes to "the Christ within us," Gal. iv. 19) from Rom. ii. 29, vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16. For classical analogies see Plut. *Conjug. Praecept.* 26; and see Clem. Alex. *Paedag.* iii. 4.

[4] Gen. xviii. 12.

[5] On Sarah's spiritual race see Rom. iv. 11; Gal. iii. 7. The word πτόησις, "scare," is probably borrowed from Prov. iii. 25 (LXX.). St. Peter was evidently familiar with the Proverbs.

[6] 1 Pet. iii. 1—7. For ἐκκόπτεσθαι (Rom. xi. 22, etc.), A. B, read ἐγκόπτεσθαι, "be hindered." Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 5.

chapter will throw into relief the beauty and wisdom of these exhortations. By the flagrancy of immorality, the frequency of divorce, and the disgust for marriage which prevailed in Rome, we may measure the blessedness of Christian matrimony. The meanest Christian slave who was imprisoned in an *ergastulum*, and would be buried in a catacomb, had no need to envy the splendid misery of a Nero or the pathetic tragedy of an Octavia's life. The life of many a Christian couple in the squalor of a humble slave-cell was unspeakably more desirable than that of the Roman profligates in their terror-haunted palaces.

> "O if they knew how pressed those splendid chains
> How little would they mourn their humbler pains!"

(5) Finally, it was the duty of *all* to be united, sympathising, fraternal, compassionate, humble-minded,[1] requiting good for evil and blessing for abuse, as being heirs of blessing. This lesson is enforced by a free citation of David's eulogy of government of the tongue, and of a peaceful disposition as the secret of a blessed life, as well as by the truth that, whether just or evildoers, we live under the eye of God.[2] Who then could harm them if they proved themselves zealots of the good?[3] Let them fear nothing, for there is a beatitude in persecution for the sake of righteousness if the will of God should so decree. Inward holiness,[4] outward readiness to

[1] Leg. ταπεινόφρονες, ℵ, A, B, C.

[2] Ps. xxxiii. 12—16. LXX.

[3] 1 Pet. iii. 13, leg. ζηλωταὶ, ℵ. A, B, C. On the thought, see a magnificent passage in Chrysostom (*Ep. ad Cyriacum*): "Should the Empress determine to banish me, let her banish me. The earth is the Lord's. If she should cast me into the sea, let her cast me into the sea. I will remember Jonah," etc.

[4] 1 Pet. iii. 15, leg. τὸν Χριστὸν, ℵ, A, B, C. "But sanctify the Christ in your hearts as Lord."

vindicate to everyone their grounds of hope with meekness and fear,[1] together with a good conscience, would in the long run make the heathen blush at their insulting and threatening calumnies against the holiness which they accused of criminality. For, contrary to the common opinion of men, it is better to suffer (if such be God's will) *unjustly* than to suffer when we deserve to do so. If we suffer for sins which we have not committed, so did our great Example.[2] "Because Christ also, once for all, suffered for sin, just for unjust, that He may lead you to God; slain in the flesh but quickened to life in the spirit, wherein also He went and preached[3] to the spirits in prison[4] who once were disobedient when the long-suffering of God awaited[5] in the days of Noah while the Ark was a-preparing; by entering wherein, few, that is, eight souls,[6] were saved through water:[7] which (water, *leg.* ὅ) also as an antitype now saveth you—namely, baptism—(not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the entreaty for a good conscience towards God[8])—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is on the right hand of God, having gone into Heaven,[9] angels

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 15. The notion that legal trials are intended by ἀπολογία, and with it the inference that the days of Trajan are alluded to, are excluded by the words "to *everyone* that asketh," etc.

[2] 1 Pet. iii. 8—17.

[3] ἐκήρυξεν=εὐηγγελίσατο, "preached the Gospel."

[4] *i.e.*, in Hades. Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4.

[5] 1 Pet. iii. 20. ἀπεξεδέχετο, ℵ, A, B, C, K, &c. The reading ἅπαξ "once for all" of Erasmus and the E.V. is quite untenable.

[6] This indicates the motive of Christ's Descent into Hades. It was *because* few only had been saved from perishing. And this is the view of such Fathers as Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* vi. 6), Origen, Athanasius, Jerome, and even, in his milder moods, Augustine (*Ep. ad Evod.* clxiv.).

[7] Perhaps this means "by water as an instrument," *i.e.*, because the water floated the Ark.

[8] See *supra*, p. 135, note 2.

[9] Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16. Perhaps, as Dr. Plumptre says, the precious fragment of an early baptismal profession.

and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him."[1]

The general meaning of this passage—Christ's descent into Hades to proclaim the Gospel to the once disobedient dead—is to every unobscured and unsophisticated mind as clear as words can make it. Theologians have attempted to get rid of this obvious reference by explaining it of Christ preaching in the person of Noah; or by making "He preached" mean "He announced *condemnation;*" or by limiting "the spirits in prison" to Adam and the Old Testament saints; or by rendering ἐν φυλακῇ "*on the watchtower* of expectation" (!); or by supposing that Christ only preached to those spirits who repented while they were being drowned! These attempts arise from that spirit of system which would fain be more orthodox than Scripture itself, and would exclude every ground of future hope from the revelation of a love too loving for hearts trained in bitter theologies. What was the effect of Christ's preaching we are not told. Some, perhaps, may like to assume that the preaching of Christ in the Unseen World was unanimously rejected by the once disobedient dead, though the mention of their former disobedience seems to imply the inference that they did hearken now. Others can, if they choose, assert that this proclamation of the Gospel to disembodied spirits was confined to *antediluvian* sinners. With such inferences we are unconcerned. "It is ours," says Alford, "to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations as far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. The inference every intelligent reader

[1] 1 Pet. iii. 8—22. Cf. Col. ii. 10—15.

will draw from the fact here announced: *it is not purgatory; it is not universal restitution; but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of divine justice:* the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it." On the other hand, we do not press the inference of Hermas and St. Clemens of Alexandria by teaching that this passage implies also *other* missions of Apostles and Saints to the world of spirits. We accept the words of Scripture, and leave the matter there in thankful hope.

Thus—continues the Apostle—as a preliminary to His exaltation, did Christ suffer for us, and we should therefore gird on the armour of the same resolve. Suffering (of course *Christian* suffering is implied) is a deathblow to concupiscence. In past times they had perpetrated the will of the Gentiles in "wine-swillings and roysterings,"[1] in lives of wanton excess, and idolatries that violated the eternal law of heaven; and now the Gentiles reviled them in astonishment that they would no longer run with them into "the same slough of dissoluteness."[2] But these Gentile opponents "shall give an account to Him that is ready to judge the living and the dead. For to this end, *even to the dead* was the Gospel preached, that, as regards men, they may be judged in the flesh, but may live as regards God in the spirit."

In the last verse we again encounter the ruthlessness of commentators. "The dead" to whom the Gospel was preached are taken to mean something quite different from "the dead" who are to give an account. The dead to whom the Gospel is preached are explained away into

[1] 1 Pet. iv. 3, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις.
[2] 1 Pet. iv. 4, ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν.

"sinners" or "the Gentiles," or "some who are *now* dead." Augustine, as might have been expected, leads the way in one wrong direction, and Calvin in another. Another view — which makes this verse mean that "Christ will judge even the dead as well as the living, because the dead too will not have been without an opportunity to receive His Gospel"—is indeed tenable. To me, however, judging of the feelings of the Apostle, from his boundless gratitude for the opportunities of obtaining forgiveness, and from the love which he inculcates towards all mankind, the connexion seems to be, "The heathen, in all their countless myriads, who seem to be hopelessly perishing around you, will be judged;—but the very reason why the Gospel was preached by Christ to the dead was in order that this judgment may be founded on principles of justice, that they may be judged (*κριθῶσι*) in their human capacity as sinners, and yet may live (*ζῶσι*) to God as regards the diviner part of their natures;"—if, that is, they accept this offer of the Gospel to them even beyond the grave.[1]

(6) "But the end of all things"—and therefore of calumny and suffering and heathen persecution in this transitory life—"is at hand. Be sound-minded, therefore, and be sober unto prayers, before all things having intense love towards one another, because love covereth a multitude of sins."[2] Then come fresh exhortations to unmurmuring hospitality (so necessary for poor and wandering Christian teachers), and to a right steward-

[1] Analogous elements of thought as to the disciplinary intent of even the severest punishments may be seen in 1 Cor. v. 5; xi. 31, 32.

[2] Prov. x. 12 (cf. xvii. 9), where it is "all sins." James v. 20 quotes the same words but perhaps in a different sense; not, as here, of love throwing a covering over the sins *of others* by forbearance (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 5, 6), but of love hiding our own sins from view.

ship of God's various gifts for the common benefit to the glory of God through Jesus Christ. They were not to regard the conflagration[1] which was burning among them to serve as their test, as though it were something strange. They ought rather to rejoice because a fellowship in Christ's sufferings would in the same proportion involve a fellowship in His glory. Reproach in the name of Christ is a beatitude. Let none of them suffer as a murderer, thief, malefactor, or intrusive meddler; but punishment for refusing to disown the name of Christian[2] is not a thing for which to blush, but rather to glorify God. It showed them to be, as it were, under the very shadow of the wings of the Shechinah. The time for judgment had come. If it began from the house of God, what would be the end of those who *disobeyed* the Gospel of God? And if the righteous be saved with difficulty, the impious and sinner—where shall he appear?[3] So then let even those that suffer commit their lives unto God, as to a faithful Creator, in well-doing.[4]

[1] πυρώσει. Were it not that this word occurs in the LXX. of Proverbs (xxvii. 21), a book with which St. Peter shows himself so familiar, we might suppose that he and St. John (Rev. xviii. 9, 18) were reminded of it by the burning of Rome.

[2] Perhaps we should read the ignorant heathen distortion, *Chrestian* (see *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 301) with ℵ.

[3] Prov. ix. 31. The words "upon earth" of the original Hebrew show that temporal judgments (as in Matt. xxiv. 22) were prominent in the writer's mind (cf. Jer. xxv. 29). Christians were suffering under the Neronian persecution, but the destruction of Jerusalem and the disintegration of the Roman Empire were not far off.

[4] 1 Pet. iv. 7—19. The latter verses (12—17) are not a repetition of iii. 13, iv. 6, because there the afflictions were spoken of in relation to their persecutors, and here in relation to their own feelings (cf. Matt. v. 11). The μὴ ξενίζεσθε is equivalent to "make yourself at home in," "regard as perfectly natural." In ver. 15, St. Peter seems to have coined the picturesque word ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοποι, "other people's bishops." (The nearest

The remainder of the Epistle is more specific. It is addressed to the elders by St. Peter—as a fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of the Christ, and therefore also a partaker of the glory about to be revealed. He exhorts them to tend the flock of God[1] among them with willing and self-denying oversight, "not as lording it over their allotted charge,[2] but proving themselves examples of the flock; then, at the manifestation of the chief Shepherd, they should carry off as their prize "the amaranthine chaplet" of the conqueror's glory.[3] The younger, too, were to be submissive to the elders, "yea, all of you, being submissive to one another, tie on humility like a knotted dress,[4] because God arrays Himself against the overweening, but to the humble He giveth grace.[5] Be humbled, then, under the strong hand of God, that He may exalt you in season, casting, once for all, all your anxiety upon Him, because He careth for you. Be sober! watch! because your adversary,[6] the Devil, like a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may

approach to the word is Plato's ἀλλοτριοπραγμοσύνη. "meddlesomeness.") The attempt (Hilgenfeld, *Einleit.* 630) to render this "informers" (*delator*), because informers were legally punishable in the days of Trajan (Plin. *Paneg.* 34, 35), has nothing in its favour. The word is a needful warning against the temptation to a prying religiosity. The ἔρξασθαι of ver. 17, proving as it does that Jerusalem was not yet destroyed, is another death-blow to all hypotheses as to the late date of the Epistle.

[1] ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου, John xxi. 16.

[2] *i.e.*, their "parishes," not "the clergy."

[3] ἀμαράντινον, not ἀμαραντός, as in i. 4:—

> "Their crowns inwove with amaranth and gold,
> Immortal amaranth . . ."—MILTON.

not like fading Nemean parsley, or Isthmian pine.

[4] Ἐγκομβώσασθε, Col. iii. 12, Ἐνδύσασθε. Κόμβωμα—"an apron" worn by slaves.

[5] "Humility is a vessel of graces," Aug. *Prov.* iii. 34.

[6] Matt. v. 25, ἀντίδικος, [illegible].

swallow up. Against whom take your stand, firm in the faith, knowing that the very same sufferings are running their full course for your band of brethren in the world. But the God of all grace, Who called you unto His eternal glory in Christ Jesus, after you have suffered a little, Himself shall perfect, establish, strengthen, place you on a sure foundation. To Him be dominion for the ages of ages. Amen.[1]

"By Silvanus, your faithful brother, as I esteem him,[2] I write to you in few words, exhorting, and confirming by my testimony, that this is the true grace of God.[3] In this take your stand![4]

"She, who is co-elect in Babylon, saluteth you,[5] and Marcus, my son. Salute one another with a kiss of love. Peace to you all in Christ Jesus. Amen."

[1] 1 Pet. v. 1—11.

[2] Fronmüller (in Lange's *Commentary*) strangely supposes that this can mean, "I conjecture that you will receive this Epistle by the hands of Silvanus!"

[3] This which I have written to you. It is very doubtful whether there is any intention *here* to ratify the orthodoxy of St. Paul's teachings, though all the Epistle shows how deeply the true St. Peter (so unlike the fictitious Peter of the *Clementines*) reverenced them.

[4] 1 Pet. v. 12, στῆτε, ℵ A, B.

[5] Ἡ συνεκλεκτή. Some take this to mean "the co-elect lady"—*i. e.*, Peter's wife (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 5). But surely a Jew would hardly have sent a greeting from his wife—a poor Galilean woman—to all these Churches, or have described her as simply ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι. It is much more natural to understand ἐκκλησία, meaning the *Church* of Rome. It is true that St. Peter has not used that word, even in his salutation, but it might none the less be in his thoughts, just as St. Luke (in Acts xxvii. 14) says αὐτή of the ship, though he has been using the word πλοῖον. On Marcus and Babylon, see *ante*, p. 113.

CHAPTER IX.

PECULIARITIES OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

"Petrus magis magisque opus esse statuit admonitione propter ingruentem corruptionem malorum hominum."—BENGEL.

IN reading the First Epistle of St. Peter, we are reading a book which even a critic so advanced as M. Renan admits to be "one of the writings of the New Testament which is the most anciently and the most unanimously cited as authentic."[1] In turning to the Second Epistle we are met by problems of acknowledged difficulty, and have to consider the claims of a document which the same writer pronounces to be "*certainly* apocryphal," and of which he says that "among true critics he does not think that it has a single defender." Such a remark is easy to make; but critics like Schmid, Guericke, Windischmann, Thiersch, Alford, and Brückner are in learning, if not in genius, as much entitled to decide such a point *ex cathedrâ* as M. Renan, and they, after deliberate examination, do accept the Epistle as genuine, and offer in its defence not a contemptuous dictum, but a serious argument. On the other hand, although it is discourteous and unwarrantable to pronounce the Epistle to be so certainly spurious that nothing but prejudice or ignorance could maintain its genuineness, neither

[1] *L'Antéchrist*, p. vi.

ought its defenders to argue as though any hesitation as to its genuineness was an impious arraignment of the Spirit of God. To say that "there is scarcely a single writing of all antiquity, sacred or profane, which must not be given up as spurious if the Second Epistle of St. Peter be not received as a genuine writing of the Apostle, and as a part of Holy Writ;"—to assert that we receive it on "the testimony of the Universal Church," which is "the Spouse and Body of Christ enlightened by the Holy Ghost;"—and that if it be "not the Word of God, but the work of an impostor, then, with reverence be it said, Christ's promise to His Church has failed, and the Holy Spirit has not been given to guide her into all truth,"—is to use a style, I cannot say of "argument," but of dogmatising traditionalism, which perilously confuses a thousand separate issues. Such assertions, if listened to, would end in making all criticism impossible, and in reducing all inquiry to mediæval torpor. They can serve no purpose but to damage in many minds the cause of religion. They confound the eternal truths of Christianity with uncertain details. They imperil the impregnable fortress of Revelation by identifying its defence with that of its weakest and most uncertain outposts. To talk of the Second Epistle of St. Peter—if, indeed, it was not the work of that Apostle—as "a shameless forgery," and of its writer as "an impostor," and of his motives as showing "intentional fraud" and "cunning fabrication,"[1] is to use language which only tends to obscure the critical faculty. Such a style of statement is an anachronism. It cannot be said too strongly that it is "inexpedient to encumber

[1] Wordsworth, *Introd.*; Fronmüller, § 3.

the discussion by an attempted *reductio ad horribile* of one of the alternatives."[1]

The question of the genuineness of this Epistle must be regarded as unsettled until the arguments adduced against it by a serious criticism can be met by counter-arguments of a criticism equally serious. Its acceptance cannot be founded upon assertions to which criticism, as such, can pay no heed. That the writing known as the Second Epistle of St. Peter is *canonical*—that for fourteen centuries it has been accepted, and rightly accepted, by the Church as a part of the Canon of Holy Scripture—is not denied. I say *rightly* accepted, because the Church would not have so received it if she had not felt that it was "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." But to say that in its present form it is absolutely the work of St. Peter—and that, if not genuine, the Church has "been imposed upon by what must, in that case, be regarded as a *Satanic device*" (!), is to claim a monopoly of the critical faculty which is refuted by every page of the history of exegesis. On all such questions Churches have erred, and may err. The Second Epistle is accepted as St. Peter's *mainly* on the authority of the Church of the fourth century;[2] but the Church of the fourth century had not the least pretence to greater authority, and had a far smaller amount of critical knowledge, than the Church of the nineteenth. The guidance of the Holy Spirit of God was promised not to one age only, but to the Church of all ages, even to the end of the world; but the lessons of century

[1] Bp. Ellicott's *Commentary*, iii. 437.

[2] It was admitted into the Canon by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363.

after century ought to have taught us that guidance into *all necessary spiritual truth* is a very different thing from critical infallibility. Theologians who usurp the right to speak with inspired positiveness on questions which are still unsettled, not only render their own pretensions liable to defeat, but seriously endamage a sacred cause. Nothing has gone farther to shake my conviction of the genuineness of the Epistle than the dangerous plausibility of many of the arguments adduced by its defenders. They have so obviously approached the question with their minds made up beforehand; they have shown themselves so eager to establish a case at all costs; they have treated as so unimportant the absence of that evidence to which in other cases they attach such extreme importance; they have been tempted to use arguments so painfully inconclusive, and to make light of counter-considerations so undeniably strong, that any one who takes the same side with them may well fear lest he too should sink into the advocate, and forget the love of simple truth. The supporters of the Epistle have done far more than its assailants to deepen my own uncertainty whether it can be regarded as the *direct* work of the Apostle.

For what are the facts with which we must start in considering the Second Epistle of St. Peter? Surely common honesty compels us to acknowledge that of all the books of the New Testament it is the one for which we can produce the smallest amount of external evidence, and which at the same time offers the greatest number of internal difficulties.

As regards the *external* evidence, the Epistle is not quoted, and is not *certainly* referred to, by a single writer in the first or second century. Neither

Polycarp, nor Ignatius, nor Barnabas, nor Clemens of Rome, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus of Antioch, nor Irenæus, nor Tertullian, nor Cyprian can be proved even to allude to it. It is not found in the Peshito Syriac, nor in the Vetus Itala. It is unknown to the Muratorian Canon. During the first two centuries the only traces of it, if traces they can be called, are to be found in the Pastor of Hermas,[1] and in a recently discovered passage of Melito of Sardis; but even these are of so distant and general a nature that it is impossible to determine whether we should regard them as reminiscences of the language of the Epistle, or accidental approximations to it. But even if we grant *all* the parallels adduced by Dietlein, the concession would be unfavourable rather than otherwise to the genuineness of the Epistle;—he ruins his own case by proving too much. For if the writers of the first and second centuries did indeed know the Epistle, it is inconceivable that not one of them should have hinted at the authority which it derived from the name of its author. When we come down to later writers, we find that, in all his learned works, it is not once alluded to by St. Clemens of Alexandria, who even seems to exclude it by the expression, "Peter in *the* Epistle."[2] Origen knew of it, but, since he uses the same expression as St. Clemens, seems—when writing accurately—to question its genuineness;[3] although, if we may trust

[1] Hermas, iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 20.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 562, *ed.* Potter. Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 14) says that Clemens, in his *Hypotyposes*, commented both on the acknowledged and the uncertain books of the N. T., not even passing by "the Apocalypse of Peter:" but that can hardly mean this Epistle.

[3] "Peter has left only one generally acknowledged Epistle—perhaps also a second, for this is considered doubtful (ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτεράν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ)." (Orig. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.)

the loose Latin translation of Rufinus, he refers to it as St. Peter's when he alludes to it popularly in a casual quotation. Firmilian († 270), a friend of Origen, is the first person who, in a letter to Cyprian, extant only in a Latin version, refers to it; but neither is this letter beyond suspicion, nor is the reference decisive.[1] Didymus, in a Latin translation of his commentary, calls the Epistle "*falsata*," and says that "it is not in the Canon."[2] Eusebius knew of it, but only recognised one genuine Epistle.[3] It was rejected by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and was still regarded as uncertain in the times of St. Gregory of Nazianzus.[4] It must, therefore, be admitted that the evidence in its favour is exceptionally weak. The First Epistle was almost universally recognised by the ancient Church; the Second was partly controverted, partly ignored—and among those who ignored or rejected it were some Fathers of the greatest learning, and of the keenest critical acumen.

These doubts were so far silenced, that it was on the whole passively accepted by men like Athanasius, Basil, Jerome, and Augustine, and towards the close of the fourth century was declared to be canonical by the Councils of Laodicea (A.D. 363), Hippo (A.D. 393), and Carthage (A.D. 396). But surely this tardy recognition is a suspicious circumstance. If the repeated references to most of the other books of the New Testament Canon by Fathers of the first three centuries be rightly regarded as proofs of their genuineness,

[1] *Epp. Cypr.* 75.

[2] The word which he used was probably νενοθέτευται, "has been accounted spurious."

[3] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 25.

[4] Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 33, *vs.* 35;

then the absence or uncertainty of any reference during the same period must so far be unfavourable. Importance is sometimes attached to fourth century decisions by saying that evidence was then extant which has not come down to us. The proposition might be disputed; but whatever such evidence may have been, it did not remove the doubts which prevailed in the great schools of Alexandria and Antioch, as represented by such eminent scholars as Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The intrinsic value of the Epistle, and the growing habit of loosely referring to it as "St. Peter's," would lead to its gradual admission without any further debate, at a period when competent critics were few and far between. St. Jerome did more than any man to hasten the acceptance of the Epistle by admitting it into the Vulgate. Yet he was too able not to observe, and too candid not to admit, that it differs from the First Epistle in style, character, and structure of words.[1] Further than this, he tells us that "most men" in his day denied that St. Peter wrote it, "on account of the dissonance of its style with the former." He is the only person in the first four centuries who offers any intelligible theory of that striking divergence. This he does by saying that "from the necessity of things he made use of different interpreters." This is indeed to accept the Epistle as genuine, but with the important modification that it is either a translation from an Aramaic original, or that the *thoughts only* are St. Peter's, while the words belong to some one else. If this be admitted, what becomes of recent attempts

[1] Jer. *Ep. ad Hedib.* ii. Compare *De Virr. Illustr.* 1.

to show that the style and phraseology are exactly what we should expect?

It is idle to lay much stress on the fact that no further doubt as to the authorship of the Epistle was expressed during long centuries of critical torpor. During those centuries there was no criticism worth speaking of, because criticism could only register the dictated conclusions of a Church which punished original inquiry as presumptuous and heretical. If any one expressed an independent opinion, however true, the Church and the world combined against him. But the moment that "the deep slumber of decided opinions" was broken by the Reformation—the moment that criticism ceased to be confronted by "the syllogism of violence"—then the doubts as to the genuineness of the Epistle began to revive. Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin freely express them, and they were shared by Cajetan, Grotius, Scaliger, and Salmasius. In modern times, since the days of Semler, an increasing number of critics have decided against the genuineness of the Epistle, including not only Baur, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Mayerhoff, Bleek, Davidson, Messner, Reuss, but even such conservative theologians as Neander, Weiss, and Huther, while Bertholdt, Ullman, Bunsen,[1] and even Lange[2] hold that, though genuine in part, it has been largely interpolated.

The last supposition, which might remove many difficulties, can hardly be accepted. The body of the Epistle must stand or fall as a whole, for it is singularly compact and homogeneous.[3] The writer has

[1] *Ignatius*, p. 175. [2] *Apostol. Zeit.* i. 152.

[3] Mayerhoff's remark, that the Epistle is clumsy and illogical, is quite false. See Brückner, *Einl.* § 1; Hofmann, p. 121; Huther, p. 306.

stated his twofold object in the last two verses. One of these objects was *warning:* it was that, by being put upon their guard, the readers might not fall away from their firm position through being misled by the error of the lawless. The other object was *exhortation:* "But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." These objects are kept steadily in view, and the structure of the letter is more distinctly articulated than that of the First.

The outline of the letter is as follows:—After the greeting (i. 1, 2) the writer enforces his hortatory object by urging the attainment of *full knowledge,* which is the consummation of Christian growth, and the essential of final salvation (3–11). Hence it is his wish to utilise the brief time which remains to him for reminding them of this truth (12—15), a truth of which they might be convinced, because Peter, with others, had been, as it were, an initiated eye-witness of the Transfiguration, and had heard the voice which was then borne from heaven (16—18); and because they all possessed the word of prophecy as a surer witness, to which they would do well to listen as to the voice of inspiration (19—21).

He thus passes quite naturally to the topic of *warning.* False teachers would bring in "sects of perdition," and he describes these false teachers in their successful blasphemies and their certain punishment, like that which fell on the world at the time of the Flood and on the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain (ii. 1—9); though, as in all such instances, the pious should be delivered (5, 7, 9). None, however, were more deserving of God's vengeance than these

impure, disdainful, self-corrupting railers—fools who rushed in where angels feared to tread (10—12), whose vileness and perniciousness are described (13, 14), and whose apostasy resembles that of Balaam (15, 16). After using various indignant images (17), to illustrate their insolence, wantonness, and cunning—which, while it promised liberty, only involved a deadly servitude (18, 19)—he says that their previous knowledge of Christ is the worst aggravation of their horrible apostasy (20—22).

He is therefore writing once more to remind his readers of previous lessons (iii. 1, 2), and especially to warn them against those scoffers who sneered at the promised coming of Christ (3, 4), and ignored the fact, that as the world had perished by water, so should it hereafter perish by fire (5—7). Let the brethren remember that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and that His delays are due to His mercy. But the dreadful day of dissolution should come (8, 9). On this thought he bases the exhortation to them to be blameless, as those who look for new heavens and a new earth, and to make a right use of God's longsuffering, in accordance with the teaching of St. Paul—whose writings they must be careful not to wrest into a wrong sense (10—16). Then into two final verses he compresses his recapitulation of the two chief topics of the letter, together with the final doxology (17, 18).

Such, then—so marked by unity and coherence—is this remarkable letter, which the Church could ill afford to lose, and which is full of impassioned warning and eloquent exhortation. We have seen how weak is the external evidence in its favour; are there any decisive

phenomena to which we can appeal by way of internal evidence of its authenticity?

That it resembles the First Epistle in the use of some peculiar expressions is certain. The word for "conversation," *i.e.*, general mode of life;[1] the remarkable word for an eye-witness, which is also the word for one initiated into the mysteries;[2] the expressions "to carry off as a prize,"[3] "spotless and blameless,"[4] and "to walk in lusts,"[5] are common to both Epistles, and are almost unknown to the rest of the New Testament.[6] If the general style were the same, these would have weight. Their weight is small when we remember (i.) that the writer of the Second Epistle must, on any supposition, have been well acquainted with the First,[7] and when we find (ii.) that the Second Epistle abounds in expressions peculiar to itself, and (iii.) that it is confessedly written in a *style* of marked difference.

The peculiarity of many expressions, of which the majority are unique,[8] must strike the most careless reader of the original. "To acquire faith by lot;"[9] "to give things which tend to life and piety;"[10] "to bring in all haste;"[11] "to furnish an abundant supply of

[1] ἀναστροφή, ἀναστρέφεσθαι (1 Pet. i. 15. 18. etc.; 2 Pet. ii. 7, iii. 11).

[2] ἐπόπτης, ἐποπτεύειν (1 Pet. ii. 3, iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 16).

[3] κομίζεσθαι (1 Pet. i. 9; v. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 13).

[4] ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι (1 Pet. i. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 14).

[5] πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις (2 Pet. ii. 10).

[6] To these may be added ἀπόθεσις (1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 14); πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (1 Pet. iv. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 12); ἄθεσμος (1 Pet. iv. 3, ἀθέμιτος, 2 Pet. ii. 7, iii. 17).

[7] 2 Pet. iii. 1.

[8] There are twenty *hapax legomena* in this brief Epistle.

[9] λαχοῦσι πίστιν, i. 1.

[10] τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένη (act.), i. 3.

[11] σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες, i. 5.

virtue;"[1] "to receive oblivion;"[2] "to furnish an abundant entrance;"[3] "the present truth;"[4] "to bring in factions of perdition;"[5] "the judgment is not idle, the destruction is not drowsily nodding;"[6] "to walk in desire of pollution;"[7] "to walk *behind* the flesh;"[8] "to esteem luxurious wantonness in the daytime as a pleasure;"[9] "eyes full of an adulteress;"[10] "insatiable of sin;"[11] "a heart trained in covetousnesses;"[12] "the mirk of the darkness;"[13] "treasured with fire;"[14] "to fall from their own steadfastness;"[15] "chains of darkness;" "to calcine to ashes;" "to hurl to Tartarus;" "to blaspheme glories;" "the heavens shall pass away hurtlingly;"[16] "the elements being consumed melt away."[17] Such are a few of the striking and even startling phrases which in the course of three short chapters stamp the style with an intense peculiarity. Nothing analogous to these phrases is found in the

[1] ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, 2 Pet. i. 5.

[2] λήθην λαβών, i. 9.

[3] ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος, i. 11.

[4] ἡ παροῦσα ἀλήθεια, i. 12.

[5] παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, ii. 7.

[6] Τὸ κρῖμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ, ἡ ἀπωλεια οὐ νυστάζει, ii. 3.

[7] ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους, ii. 10.

[8] ὀπίσω, the only passage of the N. T., except Jude 7, where ὀπίσω is not used of a *person*. It has a *special* meaning, and is unlike περιπατεῖν κατὰ σάρκα in Rom. viii. 4.

[9] ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, ii. 13.

[10] ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, ii. 14.

[11] ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, ii. 14. Some MSS. (A, B,) have the yet stranger reading ἀκαπαπάστους.

[12] γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίαις, ii. 14.

[13] ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους, ii. 17.

[14] τεθησαυρισμένοι πυρί, iii. 7.

[15] ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, iii. 17.

[16] ῥοιζηδόν, iii. 10. The strange English expression exactly corresponds to the Greek. The only form like it occurs in the LXX. in Cant. iv. 5.

[17] καυσούμενα τήκεται.

First Epistle. It may be pleaded that, as in the case of the Epistle to the Colossians, some of these words are due to the new subjects with which the Apostle has here to deal. That answer might be sufficient for three or four of them, but most are of a kind which do not arise from speciality of subject. They show a peculiarity of structure rather than of topic. Some of them are eccentricities of language adopted to clothe conceptions which would have been capable of a perfectly simple and commonplace expression.

Independently of this distinctiveness of verbiage there is a wide difference between the two Epistles in the general form of thought.[1] This is a fact too obvious to be denied. Obvious as it is to us—for besides minor differences, there is a ruggedness and tautology in the Greek of the Second Epistle very different from the smoothness of the First — this difference of style must have been far more obvious to those to whom Greek was a spoken language, and who were therefore more sensitive than we can be to its delicate refinements. It was pointed out by St. Jerome, and he assigns it as one of the causes which had led to the general rejection of the Epistle.

But it is answered, and again with perfect truth, that the style of a writer differs under differing circumstances. The style of the Epistle to the Ephesians is not the same as that to the Galatians, and both differ from the Pastoral Epistles. The style of St. John's Gospel is very unlike that of the Apocalypse. I grant this to the utmost. I have even insisted upon it and illustrated it in other instances.[2] But differences of

[1] This is admitted even by Schott.

[2] See my *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 610.

style must not be so wide as to show a difference of idiosyncrasy. They must be accompanied with resemblances of structure; and they must be partially accounted for by a long interspace of years. The difference between the styles of the First and the Second Epistle of St. Peter does not admit of these modifying circumstances; it is deeper than can be accounted for by a difference of mood and object. The Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John were separated by an interval of perhaps thirty years spent in the most polished cities of Asia. The earlier and later Epistles of St. Paul were divided from each other by many years subjected to the intense influence of ever-varying conditions. But the two Epistles of St. Peter, if both are genuine, must have been written, so far as we can learn, under identical external conditions, and written within a very short time of each other.

For this reason I set aside as irrelevant the instances adduced by the industry of critics to prove that the same writer may adopt different styles. It is true that the style of Plato's Epinomis is inferior to that of the Phædrus; that Virgil's Ciris is unworthy of the author of the Æneid; that the De Oratoribus of Tacitus is marvellously unlike his Annals; that the Paradise Lost is in a loftier key than the Paradise Regained; that the style of Twelfth Night is widely separated from that of Hamlet; that the Racine of the Alexandre is much below the Racine of the Phèdre and Athalie; that Burke on the Sublime and Beautiful is incomparably tamer than Burke's Orations; and that there are marked distinctions between the first and the second part of Goethe's Faust. But these analogies, which might easily be multiplied, do not touch the problem

before us. There is not one among them which offers a parallel to the phenomenon of total difference, not only in language, but in thought, presented by two works of the same writer dealing in great measure with the same subjects, and written from the same place, within a very short time of one another. And the differences between the two Epistles go further than this. Many are adduced, which I pass over as unimportant. But it is not easy to explain why there should be such and so many variations as those which follow. Thus—(1) In the first the writer calls himself Peter, and in the second Symeon Peter. (2) In the first he writes "to the elect sojourners of the Dispersion;" in the second to those who "obtained like precious faith with us." (3) In the first Christ's descent into Hades is a point of capital importance; in the second, where there would seem to be every reason for such an allusion, no reference is made to it. (4) In the first the writer's mind is full of the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, and the Epistle of St. James; in the second, though he makes a special reference to St. Paul, there is scarcely a single thought, and barely two expressions,[1] which can with any plausibility be referred to those two Epistles, and there is only one word[2] which can be derived from St. James. (5) Again, in the first he constantly enweaves without quotation the words of Isaiah, the Psalms, and especially the Book of Proverbs;[3] in the second there is not a single certain quotation, and if

[1] 2 Pet. i. 2, etc., Ἐπίγνωσις (Rom. i. 28, etc.); iii. 15, μακροθυμία (Rom. ii. 4).

[2] 2 Pet. ii. 14; δελεάζοντες, James i. 14.

[3] 1 Pet. i. 7, ii. 17, iv. 8, 18.

ii. 22, iii. 8 be meant for quotations they are introduced in a wholly different way.[1] (6) Of the first the keynote is *Hope;* of the second, though also written in days of persecution, the leading conception is the totally different one of "*full knowledge*."[2] (7) In the first our Lord is usually called Christ, or "the Christ," or "Jesus Christ;" in the second the simple title is never used, but He is always called "our Lord," or "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (8) In the first (α) the Coming of Christ is called "a Revelation;" in the second the "Presence" or "Day of the Lord;" (β) in the first this Advent is expected as near at hand, while in the second we are warned that it may be indefinitely distant; (γ) in the first Christ's coming is regarded as the glorification of the Saints; in the second as the destruction of the world. (9) In the first the sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord are prominent; in the second no allusion is made to them. (10) In the first there is a prevailing tone of sweetness, mildness, and fatherly dignity; the second is, as a whole, denunciatory and severe. Further difficulties have been caused to some minds (11) by the manner in which the writer of the Second Epistle, unlike the author of the First, seems anxious to thrust into prominence his own personality; (12) by the expression, "the command of *your* Apostles," in iii. 2; (13) by the manner in which the false teachers seem to be treated of sometimes as future (ἔσονται, ii.

[1] It has been supposed that i. 19, "as a lamp shining in a squalid place," is borrowed from 2 Esdr. xii. 42. "Of all the prophets thou only art left us . . . as a candle in a dark place." But so obvious a comparison need not have been borrowed.

[2] This ἐπίγνωσις is made to consist in the knowledge of the Power and Parousia of Christ. See Huther, p. 306.

1—3), sometimes as present (ii. 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, &c.);[1] (14) by the growth of a feeling which they consider to be later than the Apostolic age in the allusion to Mount Hermon as "the Holy Mount;" (15) by the unparalleled reference to St. Paul and the apparent placing of his letters on a level with the Scriptures of the Old Testament;[2] and (16) by the curious allusion to "the world standing out of water and amidst water."

(17) But we have not even yet exhausted the list of serious difficulties. An entirely new and very formidable one has just been brought to light by Dr. Abbott. It is nothing more or less than the *certainty* that either the author of the Second Epistle had read Josephus—in which case, of course, he could not have been St. Peter, since the earliest of Josephus's writings were not published till A.D. 75, and the Antiquities not earlier than A.D. 93; or (an alternative which Dr. Abbott does not discuss) that Josephus had read the Second Epistle, which, it must be confessed, is a difficult supposition. One thing is indisputable—namely, that the resemblances between the writer and the Jewish historian *cannot be accidental.*

a. The proof rests partly on single words and phrases, such as "tardiness" applied to the Divine retribution (iii. 9); "to which ye do well if ye take heed" (i. 19); "assuming oblivion" (i. 9); "bringing in besides all diligence" (i. 5); "condemned with an overthrow" (ii. 6); "equally precious;" "*epangelma*" for "pro-

[1] The same strange phenomenon meets us in the third chapter (iii. 3, ἐλεύσονται; iii. 5, λανθάνει).

[2] These differences might be greatly multiplied. See Davidson, *Introd.* i. 492—494.

mises" (i. 4); "*sesophismenos*" for "cunningly elaborated" (i. 16); and "from of old" (ii. 3). These are not found elsewhere, either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint, or not in the same senses; but they occur in Josephus, often in very similar allusions.

But the proof becomes far more striking when we consider *groups of words*, cases in which several unusual words occur together in similar passages.

Of these there are two most marked instances:—

In the Preface to the Antiquities (§§ 3, 4) Josephus tells us that Moses thought it necessary to consider "*the Divine nature*" (Θεοῦ φύσις), without which he would be unable to promote the "*virtue*" of his readers; that other legislators "*followed after myths*," but Moses, having shown that "*God was possessed of perfect virtue*," thought that men should strive after virtue; and that his laws contain nothing derogatory to the "*greatness*" of God.

In this single section, then, there are several very striking expressions, but they occur quite naturally, and betray no deviation from the historian's usual style. It is, however, surprising that we find them occurring as absolutely isolated expressions—*hapax legomena* as far as the New Testament is concerned—in this Epistle. Thus we have "that ye may become partakers of the *Divine nature*" (i. 4), where both the phrase and its context strongly recall Josephus; we have the "greatness" (*megaleiotes*) of Christ (i. 16), and in the very same verse "*following after cunningly elaborated* myths." This would alone be sufficient to attract notice; but how much more amazing is the word "*virtue*" applied to God! The word "virtue" in this sense is itself very rare in the New Testament, which uplifts the higher

standard of *holiness*. But no one can read that God called us "by His own glory *and virtue*" (for such is the true reading) without something like a start of surprise. We should be struck with the singularity of the expression in any writer; but in Josephus it is at once explained and justified by the context in which it occurs. For Josephus is not making an abstract allusion, but expressly contrasting the Ideal of Virtue in God's revelation of Himself to Moses with the shameful vices which degraded the heathen ideal of their false deities.[1]

But this is not the only group of words.

β. In the last words of Moses (as recorded by Josephus in *Antt.* iv. 8, § 2) there occur no less than eight or nine phrases, some of which either do not occur, or scarcely ever occur, in the New Testament, and some of which are not found even in the Septuagint, but every one of which occurs in this brief Epistle, and some of them in similar collocations.[2]

To me I confess that the evidential force of this fact —and Dr. Abbott informs me that further evidence is forthcoming—seems to be very strong.[3] If, then, the

[1] Ἀρετὴ only occurs in 2 Pet. i. 3, 5; Phil. iv. 8. In 1 Pet. ii. 9 the plural ἀρεταὶ is indeed applied to God, but in a very different sense. It there means "excellencies."

[2] They are, τοιᾶσδε (i. 17); θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (i. 4); "but I think it just" (i. 13); "so long as" (*id.*); "in the *present* truth" (i. 12); "mention" or "memorial" (i. 15); "departure" for "death" (*id.*); "recognising that" (i. 20; iii 3), and others. Besides these groups of words, we have phrases in 2 Pet. i. 19 and ii. 10, which occur in Jos. *Antt.* xi. 6, § 12, and *B. J.* iii. 9, § 3, but not elsewhere in the N. T. or LXX.

[3] Since these pages have been in the press Dr. Abbott has published his very interesting discovery in the *Expositor* for January, 1882. Some parts of his second paper are so similar to my own remarks, that I think it right to say that these pages were in print before I had read it. Besides the coincidences of phrase, he points out that the allusions to Noah and Balaam in 2 Pet. ii. 5, 8 point to *Hagadôth* found in Jos. *Antt.* i. 3, § 1; iv. 6, § 3.

Epistle be genuine, it cannot be questioned that it was known to Josephus. Here, however, we are met by the difficulty that the same argument does not apply to the First Epistle, so that once more we have a marked distinction between the two.

(18) Once again, if the Second Epistle of St. Peter be genuine, it was written within a short time of the Apocalypse; yet how different is the tone of the two writings with respect to the Coming of Christ! In the Apocalypse the belief in its immediate imminence "blazes out in its brightest flame, and takes its most concrete form in the idea of the Millennium:" on the other hand, in the Second Epistle of St. Peter, we hear of scoffers, who are already beginning to point out that in their opinion the nearness of the Parousia is a mere delusion, and to ask, "Where is the promise of this coming?" Now, how does the writer meet their objections? Not by thundering forth with yet deeper conviction MARANATHA, but by showing that, as far as human calculations of time were concerned, the coming might be still indefinitely delayed, because with the Lord a thousand years are as one day. There is not another passage in the whole New Testament which implies that the Parousia—for which the early Christians looked with such intense earnestness—so far from being manifested in that very generation, might not take place for even a millennium hence. However we explain the phrase, "Since the fathers fell asleep," the point of view seems to mark an age later than that of the true St. Peter.[1] It seems to point to an epoch in which those who, like the Montanists, still expected

[1] Even in Justin Martyr's time there was still the expectation of an immediate Parousia (*Dial c. Tryph.* 80).

the instant close of the age (in another sense than that in which it had already been accomplished by the fall of Jerusalem) were few in number.[1]

The last chapter of the Epistle is devoted to the correction of two errors—namely (i.), the acceptance of the scoff about the delay in Christ's Second Coming, and (ii.) the misuse of the Epistles of St. Paul. The first error is dealt with at some length (iii. 1—13); the second is dismissed in a few words (15—16). It cannot be said that either of these topics *necessarily* indicates an age later than that of St. Peter. They would, however, have been very suitable to the second century, when even the Fall of Jerusalem—in which men failed to recognise a true Coming of Christ—had not been followed by the expected Advent in flaming fire; and when, as we know, some Gnostic sects, like that of Marcion, were beginning to make a dangerous use of the arguments of St. Paul.

No doubt as regards every one of these difficulties *something* more or less possible, probable, or plausible may be urged. It may be said, for instance, that after St. Peter had written the First Epistle the letter of St. Jude was brought to him, and threw him into such a state of indignant alarm as to alter his whole frame of mind, and to account for many of the differences above mentioned. The non-allusion to Christ's preaching in Hades may be referred to this indignation of mind, and it may be pointed out that St. Peter, if the Second Epistle be genuine, shows

[1] See Baur, *First Three Centuries*, i. 247, ii. 45 (E. Tr.). The Montanist view was no doubt that of the primitive Church. See Mr. De Soyre's excellent Essay on Montanism, and Bonwelsch, *Die Nähe des Weltendes*, p. 76.

the same interest as before in events to which other Apostles have made little or no allusion. The absence or presence of certain marked influences, and modes of quoting Scripture, may be regarded as having in it nothing decisive. The expression "*your* Apostles" may merely mean "St. Paul and those who preached to you." "The Holy Mount," though not a phrase which we should have expected, may be defended on Old Testament analogies,[1] and may hardly involve its modern connotations. The allusion to St. Paul's Epistles may not be to all of them which *we* possess, but only to those, whether lost or extant, which may have been made known to St. Peter by Silvanus or Mark; and doubtless the power of the Holy Spirit was recognised in them from the earliest age. Whether these answers be regarded as sufficient to support the cause in which they are urged, must depend on the feelings of the reader. They mitigate some of the difficulties; few, I think, would pretend to say that they are adequate to remove them all. It must be remembered that objections which might be overruled if they stood alone, may acquire from their number and variety a cumulative force. Nor are *all* these objections easy to meet. The mixture, for instance, of presents and futures in the description of the False Teachers, is a difficulty which has been met by untenable remarks about the "Prophetic style." That St. Jude's Epistle was *prior* to that of St. Peter seems to me an irrefragable conclusion; and if so, it is an unsolved—though I will not say insoluble—difficulty that St. Peter should have described in prophetic futures the teachers whom St. Jude had already denounced as active workers.

[1] Is. xxvii. 13.

There is no known reason why he should have mingled predictions of their appearance with traits of their existing physiognomy. If it be urged that St. Peter merely prophesies the worse development of contemporary germs of evil, the answer is that it would be impossible to imagine *anything* more pernicious than the apostates whom St. Jude had scathed with his terrible invective.[1] Before we can acquiesce in these methods of defence let us ask ourselves whether they would have had the least weight with us if no predisposition to side with the popular opinion were involved. Would they have been held sufficient to prove the genuineness of a classic treatise, or even of a tract of any of the Fathers?

(19.) But we have not even now exhausted the peculiarities of this weakly-authenticated letter. We have still to consider the extraordinary phenomenon which it presents in its relationship to the short Epistle of Jude. On the facts of this relationship each successive writer comes to a different conclusion; but, after careful consideration and comparison of the two documents, it seems to my own mind *impossible to doubt* that Jude was the earlier of the two writers.[2]

[1] Dean Alford and others point out resemblances in this Epistle to the style and phraseology of St. Peter's speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, such as the word "piety" (*εὐσέβεια*) (Acts iii. 12), "the Day of the Lord" (iii. 10; Acts ii. 20), and a few others. But they seem to me too few and too shadowy for their purpose; nor can we observe in the Second Epistle (with one marked exception, *vide infra*, p. 204) that influence of events narrated in the Gospels on the character and views of St. Peter, which may be so strikingly traced in the First Epistle (*supra*, p. 124, *fg.*).

[2] The notion of Luther, Wolf, &c., that 2 Peter was the earlier, though still supported by Thiersch, Dietlein, Fronmüller, Hofmann, Wordsworth, &c., is being more and more abandoned. The priority of St. Jude is accepted by Herder, Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Neander, De Wette, Mayerhoff, Guerike, Reuss, Bleek, Weiss, Wiesinger, Brückner, Huther, Ewald, Alford, Plumptre, Dr. S. Davidson. &c.

If so, the fact that such an Apostle as St. Peter should, without even referring to him by name, have incorporated successively so many of the thoughts and expressions of one who, like St. Jude, was not an Apostle, is yet another extraordinary circumstance.[1] To talk of "plagiarism" would be to import modern notions into the enquiry; and if St. Peter were the borrower, we shall see that he deals with his materials in a wise and independent manner. But as to any further questions which may arise from the relationship of the two writers, we must be content to say that we have no data on which to furnish an answer.

The closeness of the relationship will be seen at a glance by comparing the parallel passages side by side. The characteristics of the "impious persons" of Jude and that of the "false teachers" of St. Peter are identical. Both are marked by those insidious and subterranean methods which seem to be inseparable from the character of religious partisans (Jud. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 1—3); by impious wantonness (*id.*, and Jud. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 10); by denial of Christ (*id.*); by slander of dignities (Jud. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 10); by corruption of natural instincts (Jud. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 12); by greed (Jud. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 14, 15); by pompous assertions and scoffing mockery (Jud. 16—18; 2 Pet. ii. 18, iii. 3). Both are doomed to swift judgment; are described by very similar metaphors; are threatened with the same punishments; are compared to Balaam; and are warned by the example of the Cities of the Plain. But if the two passages are read side by side, it can hardly be denied that the language of St. Jude is the more eloquent and impetuous, while that of

[1] Bertholdt and Lange suppose that this chapter was subsequently interpolated into the Second Epistle of St. Peter.

St. Peter is the more elaborate and restrained. The burning lava of St. Jude's indignation has evidently poured itself through the secondary channels of a temperament which would probably have been more congenial to its reception at an earlier period. St. Peter, if it be he, catches something of the Judaic fire and heat of his contemporary, but he modifies, softens, and corrects his vehement phrases. His language is but *an echo* of the thunder. He throws the description, in part at least, into the future, as though to indicate that those against whom he warns his readers have not yet burst into the full blossom of their iniquity.

Travelling through Christian communities as one of "the brethren of the Lord,"[1] St. Jude seems to have come into personal contact with bodies of corrupt, greedy, and subtle Antinomians closely resembling those "Gnostics before Gnosticism" whose appearance had been noted by the prescient eye of St. Paul. Having actually witnessed their baleful influence, he can depict them with startling power and clearness, and he rolls over them peal after peal of Apocalyptic denunciation. St. Peter, now perhaps awaiting his death at Rome, has not personally seen them—not, at any rate, in their worst and most undisguised developments. Startled by the language of St. Jude—such is a perhaps admissible hypothesis—finding that the very words and thoughts and sentences of that brief but strange and powerful letter keep ringing with ominous sound in his memory—in *his* heart too the fire burns and he speaks with his tongue. The mystery of iniquity, he implies, is already working, but he cannot

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

bring himself to believe that it has invaded all the Churches to which he writes, and therefore he predicts even while he is describing, and describes while he predicts. The language of his second chapter seems to show that the author was writing from vivid and even verbal memory of St. Jude's letter, but not with its words, lying actually before him. In some cases he presents the curious but familiar phenomenon of the memory being magnetized rather by the sounds of the words than by the words themselves.[1] Thus from external similarity St. Jude's "sunken reefs" (*spilades*) become "spots" (*spiloi*),[2] and St. Jude's "love-feasts" (*agapai*) become "deceits" (*apatai*). But, besides this, it is evident that both in greater and smaller matters a spirit of conscious modification is at work, both in the way of addition and omission. Where St. Jude speaks of "*clouds* without water" St. Peter, to avoid any scientific cavil—since a cloud without water is a thing not conceivable—speaks of "*wells* without water." Where St. Jude refers to the profanation of the Agapæ St. Peter's allusion is more distant and general. St. Jude in three successive clauses speaks of the fall of the angels through fleshly lusts; of Sodom and Gomorrha as "undergoing a judgment of æonian fire;" of a peculiar form of ceremonial pollution familiar to all who were trained in the Levitic law; of the dispute between Michael the Archangel and the Devil about the body of Moses; and of the corruption of natural and instinctive

[1] Weiss says that "St. Peter" has here been influenced by the "*wortklang*."

[2] I am aware that some take σπιλάδες to mean the same as σπῖλοι, and it is so understood in the ancient versions. See Bishop Lightfoot on *Revision*, p. 137. Dr. Abbott points out (*Expositor*, Feb. 1882, p. 145) that a group of words in this paragraph is also found in Is. lvi. 7—lvii. 5.

knowledge. He then proceeds to compare these evil-doers to Cain, to Balaam, and to Korah, and after an impassioned outburst of metaphors applies to them a prophecy from the apocryphal Book of Enoch. It is instructive to see how the writer of this later Epistle deals with the burning material thus before him. To the fall of the angels he only alludes in the most general manner, excluding all reference to the Rabbinic tradition, which sprung out of inferences from Gen. vi. 2. Omitting St. Jude's allusion to the Israelites in the wilderness, he substitutes a reference to the Deluge. Omitting, perhaps as liable to be misunderstood, the æonian fire of Sodom and Gomorrha, he only says that these cities were reduced to ashes, while he is careful to add, by way of encouragement to the faithful, that Lot was saved. He omits as painful, and to Hellenic readers hardly intelligible, *both* of St. Jude's allusions to certain forms of Levitic pollutions.[1] He omits, as being derived from the apocryphal *Ascension of Moses*, all allusion to the legend about the dispute of Michael and Satan, and even the name of the Archangel, and, in a passage which, apart from the parallel in St. Jude, would be extremely obscure, he gives to the reference a general turn, which, if it conveyed to the readers any distinct conception, would remind them rather of the accuser of the Brethren in the Book of Zechariah. St. Jude, speaking throughout rather of vicious livers than of false teachers, describes them with great clearness as blaspheming in subjects about which they know nothing, and corrupting the knowledge which comes to them instinctively, as it does to animals without reason. The later writer remembers the words "as the animals

[1] Lev. xv. 16, 17; Jude 8, 23.

"without reason," but by an ingenious figure of speech, in which the same word serves a double purpose,[1] applies it to compare the *hopeless end* of the false teachers to that of animals. Omitting the instances of Cain and of Korah, but amplifying that of Balaam, which was more germane to his purpose, he tones down the exuberance of St. Jude's rhetoric. Perhaps because he is only writing from impressions without the original manuscript before him, while substituting "wells without water" for "clouds without water," he *adds* the clause "clouds chased by the hurricane." He omits St. Jude's "wandering stars," and yet applies directly to the teachers the powerful metaphor "for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved for ever." Again, he omits the prophecy of Enoch, probably because it is taken from an apocryphal book; and lastly, he mentions—as a specific instance of the scoffs to which St. Jude only alludes—the mocking questions which were suggested by the delay of Christ's return. I must confess my inability to see how any one who approaches the enquiry with no ready-made theories can fail to come to the conclusion that the priority in this instance belongs to St. Jude. It would have been impossible for such a burning and withering blast of defiance

[1] This figure of speech is called *antanaclisis*, and consists in the use of the same word twice in different senses in the same passage. (see *supra*, p. 165, the note on 1 Pet. iii. 1). Here φθορὰ is first "destruction," and then "corruption." Compare 2 Pet. ii. 12, "But these, as reasonless animals, creatures of nature (φυσικὰ), born for capture and *destruction* (φθορὰν), blaspheming in things of which they are ignorant (ἀγνοοῦσιν), shall be destroyed in their own *corruption* (ἐν τῇ αὐτῶν φθορᾷ καταφθαρήσονται)," with Jude 10, "These, in all things which they know not (οὐκ οἴδασιν), blaspheme; but all the things which, like the reasonless animals, they know naturally (φυσικῶς), in these they corrupt themselves (φθείρονται)."

and invective as his brief letter to have been composed on principles of modification and addition.[1] All the marks which indicate the reflective treatment of an existing document are to be seen in the Second Epistle of St. Peter. In every instance of variation we see the *reasons* which influenced the later writer. The instances of Cain and Korah did not suit his purpose, which dealt rather with secret corruption than flagrant violence, and with errors of theory than with undisguised revolt. But, had St. Peter written first, there is *no* reason why St. Jude should have omitted so striking and apposite an example as was furnished by the Deluge. It is inconceivable that St. Jude should simply have taken a paragraph of a longer Epistle, have added apocryphal illustrations to it, and flashed lightning into it by a process of reflective treatment. All literary probability decisively shows that the more guarded, more dignified, more exclusively authoritative composition—the one less liable to excite offence and cavil—would be the later of the two. There is nothing absurd in the supposition that a later writer, powerfully moved by the state of things revealed in the letter of St. Jude, should, in a longer and in some respects weightier epistle, have utilised, while yet he modified, that powerful utterance, abandoning its triplicity of structure,[2] and omitting those Hebraic references which would have been a stumbling-block to a wider circle

[1] The genius and fine literary instinct of Herder saw this at once: "Siehe welch ein ganzer kräftiger, wie ein Feuerrad in sich selbst zurücklaufender Brief: man nehme das Schreiben Petrus dazu, wie es einleitet, mildert, auslässt, &c." So, too, Weiss, Huther, &c.

[2] See *infra*, p. 236.

of readers. The notion that St. Jude endeavoured to "improve upon" St. Peter is, I say, a literary impossibility; and if in some instances the phrases of St. Jude seem more antithetical and striking, and his description clearer, I have sufficiently accounted for the inferiority—if it be inferiority—of St. Peter by the supposition that he was a man of more restrained temperament; that he wrote under the influence of reminiscences and impressions; and that he was warning against forms of evil with which he had not come into so personal a contact.

Having now examined—fairly, I trust, and as fully as my limits will allow—the peculiarities of the Epistle before us, and the serious difficulties which lie in the way of our regarding it as the work of St. Peter, I will state one or two of the reasons why, in spite of these difficulties, I cannot regard it as *certainly* spurious. They are mainly three:—

1. First, we must not wholly ignore the similarity in expression and tone of thought between this Epistle and the First,[1] nor the slight resemblances which it offers to St. Peter's speeches recorded in the Acts.[2] The resemblance of the writer to St. Peter in tone of

[1] Words common to both Epistles are "precious" (τίμιος), "abundantly furnish" (ἐπιχορηγέω), "brotherly love" (φιλαδελφία), "eye-witnesses" (ἐπόπται), "wantonness" (ἀσέλγεια), "spotless" (ἄσπιλος). In both there is a prominence of the Deluge and of Prophecy. See Plumptre, *Introd.*, p. 75. I have pointed out that in both occurs a specimen of the figure called *antanaclisis* ("word" in 1 Pet. iii. 1, "corruption" in 2 Pet. ii. 12). This has, I believe, escaped the notice of previous inquirers. See *supra*, pp. 165, 201.

[2] This is fully worked out by Prof. Lumby in the *Expositor*, iv. 372-399 and 446-469. But in any case the writer of the Second Epistle would be very familiar with the language of the First. *Differences*, in a question of this kind, furnish a far more serious consideration than identities and resemblances.

mind[1]—as, for instance, in his largeheartedness to the Gentiles,[2] in his fondness for the less trodden paths of Biblical illustration and enquiry, and in his tendency to soften instances of doom by the parallel of instances of deliverance—must also be allowed their due weight. Under this head I may refer to the subtle *reminiscences* of the Transfiguration. Of the *appeal* to the Transfiguration as a source of the writer's conviction, it may of course be said that it would naturally occur to any one assuming the name of St. Peter; but the casual subsequent introduction of the word "tabernacle,"[3] and of the most unusual word for "decease,"[4] not in any formal connexion with the appeal, but by an inimitably natural association of ideas, has always seemed to me an important item of evidence. To this must be added the little-noticed indication that the Transfiguration probably took place at night, though it is not so stated in the Gospels. This would at once account for the following comparison of the word of prophecy to "a light shining in a squalid place."

2. Another important consideration is the *ancientness* of this Epistle. If we cannot infer this from the vague resemblances to it adduced from passages in the Apostolic Fathers, we may infer it from three circumstances—namely, the want of all *specific* features of later Gnosticism in the heretics here described; the absence of allusions to ecclesiastical organisation; and the absence of any traces of the

[1] Compare 2 Pet. i. 17, 21; ii. 1, 13; with Acts iii. 12; ii. 2; iv. 24; ii. 15.

[2] 2 Pet. i. 1.

[3] σκήνωμα. Matt. xvii. 4.

[4] ἔξοδος, "departure," *i.e.*, death, as in Jos. *Antt.* iv. 812. Wisd. iii. 2.

fall of Jerusalem. As to the first point, is it not certain that a later writer would have aimed his remonstrances at something more distinctly and definitely resembling the heresies of Cerinthus or Ebion, or, later still, of Carpocrates and Valentinus? As to the second point, it is probably better known to us than it was even to many writers in the second century, that there had been a rapid tendency to de-synonymize the words "bishop" and "presbyter," and that the consequent development of "episcopal" power was due to the growth of heresy, against which it was designed to be a bulwark.[1] If, then, the writer of this Epistle was a *falsarius*, writing late in the second century, it is difficult to imagine that he would not have adopted the same tone in reference to this subject as the other writers of his age. As regards the fall of Jerusalem, it may, of course, be said that any reference to it would have betrayed the pseudonymous character of the writer; but I am now only arguing that there are no *traces* of the state of mind produced by the Jewish catastrophe. Is it not probable that a *falsarius* of the ability pre-supposed by this Epistle would have seized the grand opportunity of introducing *as a prediction* an illustration which would have been in all respects so overwhelmingly apposite? But in any case the end of the Jewish polity was an event so stupendous that no writer dealing with such subjects as those before us could have succeeded in excluding every trace of an occurrence which so radically modified the tone of Christian thought.

[1] In the First Epistle the word *episkopos* only occurs once, and that in its *general* sense of "guardian" (1 Pet. ii. 25), and each Church has only its "presbyters," with whom the Apostle ranks himself (1 Pet. v. 1).

3. One more consideration remains, which seems to me of capital importance. It is the superiority of this Epistle to every one of the uncanonical writings of the first and second centuries. If we are to accept the theories of modern critics, that the Epistles of the Captivity, and the Pastoral Epistles, and the Gospel of St. John, and the Second Epistle of St. Peter are the works of "forgers," then—seeing the indescribable superiority of these writings to all others which saw the light during the epoch at which they are supposed to have been written—we are driven to the extraordinary conclusion that the best strength and brilliancy and spiritual insight of the second century is to be found in its pseudonymous writings! Who will venture to assert that any Apostolic Father—that Clemens of Rome, or Ignatius, or Polycarp, or Hermas, or Justin Martyr could have written so much as twenty consecutive verses so eloquent and so powerful as those of the Second Epistle of St. Peter? No *known* member of the Church in that age could have been the writer; not even the author of the Epistle to Diognetus. Would a writer so much more powerful than any of these have remained uninfluential and unknown? Would one who could wield his pen with so inspired a power have failed to write a line in his own name, and for the immediate benefit of his own contemporaries?

In the face, then, of these counter-difficulties, I see no solution of the problem but the one which St. Jerome indicated fourteen centuries ago.[1] I believe that we may perhaps recognise in this Epistle the

[1] "Stilo inter se et charactere discrepant structuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus." —*Ep. ad Hedib.* 120, 11.

opinions, the influence, the impress, direct or indirect, of the great Apostle of the Circumcision. If we cannot find his individual style, if we are faced by many peculiarities, if we miss characteristic expressions, if we recognise a different mode of workmanship, some of these difficulties would be removed by the supposition of a literary amanuensis. The supposition of an Aramaic original, as supported by Mr. King, seems to me untenable.[1] This Epistle is addressed quite as much to Gentiles as to Jews; and even if the Jews of the Dispersion understood Aramaic, the Gentiles did not. This suggestion, moreover, does not remove the most serious difficulties. The Epistle, though it does not show the mastery of Hellenistic Greek possessed by some of the New Testament writers, has yet an energy of its own which excludes the possibility of its being a translation.[2] I believe there is much to support the conclusion—at which I had arrived before I became aware of the resemblances to Josephus—that we have not here the words and style of the great Apostle, but that he lent to this Epistle the sanction of his name and the assistance of his advice. If this be so, it is still in its main essence genuine as well as canonical, and there is a reason both for its peculiarities and for its tardy reception. On this hypothesis we may rejoice that we have

[1] A translation would not have such a figure as that involved in the use of φθορὰ (first "destruction," then "corruption") in ii. 12, or such an alliteration as προφήτου παραφρονίαν in ii. 16.

[2] "Diese ist fast ohne alle Ausnahme sehr fein Griechisch, voll der freiesten ächt Griechischen Wortstellungen und Satzbildungen," &c.—Ewald, *Sendschr.* ii. 110. It may, however, be best described as the poetic Greek of one who had partly learned the language from the tragedians. The repetitions of words are due to the same sparse but sonorous vocabulary of the amanuensis.

preserved to us both the encouragements addressed to the Church by St. Peter, and his warnings against anti-Christian heresies. These heresies, as we see from the Second Epistle to Timothy, had also occupied a large space in the last thoughts of St. Paul. St. Peter speaks of them mainly in the future, as St. Paul had done in his farewell to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. It is said that when Charlemagne first saw the ships of the pirate Norsemen he burst into tears, not because he feared that they would give *him* any trouble, but because he foresaw the miseries which they would inflict upon his subjects in the future. So it was with the Apostles. The errors of which others only saw the germ, loomed large on the horizon of their prophetic insight, although it was not until after their death that they assumed their full proportions as the perilous heresies of Gnostic speculation.

CHAPTER X.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER.

Ἐν οἷς ἐστι δυσνόητά τινα.—2 Peter iii. 16.

INSTEAD of following the plan which I have hitherto adopted, of endeavouring to take the reader through each Epistle by explaining and epitomising its general purpose in language which may counteract the deadening effect of over-familiarity, I have thought it best to re-translate the whole of this Epistle. I have done so for several reasons. In previous instances I have given a literal version of every passage which was obscure, or specially remarkable, or in which the English Version seemed incorrect, or difficult of apprehension, or dependent on inferior readings. This Epistle has given rise to so many controversies, it is so remarkably compact in its structure, its expressions are so unusual, and sometimes even so astonishing, that I have thought it best to retranslate the whole of it as closely as I could, appending in the briefest form such notes as seemed most necessary. I know that the reader may feel inclined to leave the translation unread, under the notion that he is already familiar with a version not only infinitely more dear to him, but also more euphonious, more smooth, more literary, and (as it will perhaps seem to him) more easy to understand. I would, however, ask him to follow me in this version,

because our English Bible, with all its splendid merits, constantly misses the peculiarities of the writer's diction through its besetting fondness for needless variations. My translation, made, I ought to say, before the Revised Version appeared, and with a different object, is meant throughout to be not only a literal version, but also a running commentary.[1]

SYMEON[2] PETER, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained[3] a like precious faith with us, in the righteousness of our God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ,[4] grace to you and peace be multiplied in the full knowledge[5] of God and of Jesus our Lord. Seeing that His Divine power hath given us all things that pertain to life and piety,[6] by means of the full knowledge of Him Who called us by His own glory and virtue;[7] by means of which He hath given us His greatest and precious promises,[8] that by their means ye may become partakers of Divine nature, having escaped from the corruption which is in the world in lust. And on this very

[1] I may perhaps be allowed to remark that, though this book, no less than my *Life of Christ* and *Life of St. Paul* has been written without the aid which I should have derived from the Revised Version, I find that there is scarcely a single instance in which the corrections I had ventured to make, and the readings which I had selected, were not in accordance with those of the Revisers. The fact that the renderings which I have given are often those which the Revisers place in the margin, may serve to illustrate the exact reproduction of the peculiarities of the original, at which I have always aimed.

[2] The adoption of this form at once marks a Hebraist.

[3] λαχοῦσι, Acts i. 17 (St. Peter).

[4] "Of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" would also be grammatical, but see on Tit. ii. 13, *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 533; and the next verse seems to show that the Father and the Son are here meant.

[5] Ἐπίγνωσις, "full knowledge," is the leading word of this Epistle (as "hope" is of 1 Pet.).

[6] Εὐσέβεια. The word only occurs elsewhere in Acts iii. 12 and the pastoral Epistles. θεῖος, "divine," is peculiar to this Epistle. (Cf. Acts xvii. 29.)

[7] Ἀρετὴ, here alone of God. In 1 Pet. ii. 9 the word is ἀρετὰς, which is quite different. *Leg.*, ἰδίᾳ δ. καὶ ἀρ., ℵ, A, C. The writer is fond of using the emphatic ἴδιος (2 Pet. ii. 22; iii. 3, 16, 17; 1 Pet. iii. 15).

[8] As in 2 Pet. iii. 13.

account, adding all earnestness,[1] abundantly furnish[2] in your faith virtue, and in your virtue knowledge, and in your knowledge self-control, and in your self-control endurance, and in your endurance piety, and in your piety brotherly affection, and in your brotherly affection love.[3] For these things, when they exist and abound, render you neither idle nor unfruitful unto the full knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.[4] For he in whom they are not is blind, wilfully closing his eyes,[5] assuming oblivion[6] of his purification from his olden sins.[7] Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make sure your calling and election, for by so doing ye shall never stumble.[8] For there shall be richly furnished to you the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (i. 1—11).[9]

Wherefore I will not neglect to remind you always about these things, though ye know them, and have been firmly fixed in the present truth.[10] But I consider it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to arouse you by way of reminder, knowing that swiftly shall come the laying aside of this my tabernacle,[11] as even our Lord Jesus Christ showed me.[12] But I will be diligent, that you may

[1] εἰσφέρειν σπουδήν. Jos. *Antt.* xx. 9, § 2.

[2] ἐπιχορήγησατε. The E. V. "Add to your faith virtue, &c." is quite untenable.

[3] For these virtues see the first Epistle, where every one of them is mentioned, even the less common words ἀρετή (1 Pet. ii. 9, *plur.*), φιλαδελφία (1 Pet. i. 22), and γνῶσις (1 Pet. iii. 7).

[4] Comp. Col. i. 10.

[5] μυωπάζων, one of the numerous *hapax legomena* of this Epistle. There is a gloss ψηλαφῶν, "fumbling his way." If the meaning "short-sighted" (Arist. *Probl.* xxxi. § 16) be adopted (as in E. V.), it may mean "blind to the far-off heavenly things, able only to see the near earthly things."

[6] Comp. Jos. *Antt.* ii. 6, § 9.

[7] *I.e.*, by Baptism.—Chrysost., &c.

[8] Ja. ii. 10, iii. 2.

[9] "Furnish knowledge, self-control, &c. (ver. 5), and you shall be rewarded in kind; for so the entrance into Christ's eternal kingdom shall be furnished richly to you."

[10] Ver. 12, ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. Cf. Jude 5; Rom. xv. 14; 1 Pet. v. 12.

[11] A mixture of the metaphors of a robe and a building, as in 2 Cor. v. 1 (De Wette).

[12] John xxi. 17, 18 (but of course that was written long afterwards, if the Epistle be genuine).

be able[1] even on every occasion after my departure, to make mention of these things.[2] For it was not by following in the track of elaborated myths[3] that we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but by having been initiated,[4] as eye-witnesses, into His Majesty. For having received honour and glory from God the Father when a voice such as this was borne to Him[5] from the magnificent glory,[6] "My Son, my Beloved is this,[7] in whom I am well pleased—"[8] And this voice *we* heard borne from Heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount.[9] And still stronger is the surety we have in the prophetic word,[10] whereunto ye do well if ye take heed[11] as to a lamp shining in a squalid place,[12] until the day

[1] *ἔχειν—δύνασθαι*, as in Lk. vii. 42.

[2] This is the ordinary meaning of *μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*. I have already noticed the interesting use of *σκήνωμα* and *ἔξοδος* (*vide supra*, p. 204).

[3] *μύθοις*. See on 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7, *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 517; but each commentator guesses differently as to the kind of myths alluded to. The best comment is Jos. *Antt.* Prœm. § 4: "All other lawgivers *following on the track of their myths*, transferred to the gods the shame of their human sins."

[4] *ἐπόπται*, a technical word of the Eleusinian mysteries (used in 2 Macc. iii. 39).

[5] *ἐνεχθείσης*, a most unusual expression, found also in 1 Pet. i. 13. Perhaps it may be explained of the rushing wind accompanying the Bath Kol. Cf. Acts ii. 2. It is analogous to נָפַל (Is. ix. 8). The Evangelists use *γίγνεται*, *ἔρχεται* (Lk. ix. 35; John xii. 30).

[6] The glory is "the Shechinah" which uttered the voice (*ὑπό*).

[7] *Ουτός ἐστιν, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου*, א, A, C, K, L. The variations from the Gospel narrative are in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle. "*In* whom," lit. "unto whom."

[8] The sentence is unfinished in the original (*Anakoluthon*).

[9] The inference from this expression, as showing a post-Apostolic date, is not unreasonable, but the epithet may be fairly explained by Jewish conceptions (Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15).

[10] Ver. 19, *βεβαιότερον*. Why "*more* sure?" Because wider in its range, and more varied, and coming from many, and bringing a more intense personal conviction than the testimony to a single fact. The reference to prophecy is prominent in both Epistles (1 Pet. i. 11, *seq.*). Perhaps, too, we may trace the early tendency to underrate the force of individual visions, which we find existing in St. Paul's day (see *Life of St. Paul*, i. 193), and which is so strongly marked in the Clementines (*Hom.* xvii. 13). The "prophetic word" may surely include New Testament as well as Old Testament prophecies (Acts xxi. 10, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 1 Thess. v. 20; 1 Tim. i. 18).

[11] Jos. *Antt.* xi. 6, § 12, *οἷς ποιήσετε καλῶς μὴ προσέχοντες*. [12] *αὐχμηρῷ*.

dawn, and the morning star arise in your hearts;[1] knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture proves to be of private interpretation.[2] For prophecy was never borne along by will of man, but being borne along by the Holy Spirit, men spoke from God (i. 12—21).

But there rose false prophets also among the people, as also among you shall be false teachers, of a kind[3] who shall secretly introduce factions of perdition,[4] denying even the Master that bought them,[5] bringing upon themselves swift perdition. And many shall follow in the track[6] of their wantonness,[7] on whose account the way of the truth shall be railed at.[8] And in covetousness, with fictitious speeches, shall they make trade of you, for whom, since long ago,

[1] The meaning seems to be that the lamp of prophecy will become needless in the full noonday blaze of perfect conviction.

[2] Of the many possible explanations of these words, I accept that which makes them mean "that the prophets did not speak by spontaneous knowledge, and spoke more than they could themselves interpret," as where Philo says, "the prophet utters nothing of his own." If his *utterance* is not his own, his *interpretation* may also well be inadequate. The remark then resembles 1 Pet. i. 10—12. The γίνεται would then mean that History proves the truth of this remark. Ἐπίλυσις only occurs in Aquila's version of Gen. xl. 8, and ἐπιλύω means "I explain" in Mk. iv. 34. The verb ἐπιλύω occurs in Gen. xl. 8, xli. 12, and the explanation of the thought must be looked for in Gen. xli. 15, 16 (comp. Jer. xxiii. 26). [Since writing this note I see that Dr. Abbott points out that *several* words are here borrowed from the passage in Philo, *Quis Rer. Div. Haer.* p. 52, viz.: θεοφόρητος, φωσφόρος, ἴδιος, ἀνατέλλει. This seems to be decisive as to the meaning.]

[3] οἵτινες. The transition from the true to the false prophets, and so to existing false teachers, is very natural.

[4] αἱρέσεις. The meaning "heresies" is later (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19, Gal. v. 20, Tit. iii. 10).

[5] Peter's mere momentary "denial" at a moment of strong temptation differs wholly from this persistent negation and apostasy. Ἀγοράσαντα—notice the clear expression of Christ's death *for all*. In the participial constructions of this chapter (which I have faithfully reproduced) the sentences sometimes have an unfinished look.

[6] ἐξακολουθήσουσιν.

[7] *Leg.*, ἀσελγείαις, ℵ, A, B, C, K, L. "Lecheries," Wiclyf.

[8] This furnishes us with an important historical hint. The strange and odious calumnies which were rife from the earliest days against the Christians, originated in the antinomian heresies of Gnostic and other sects in which perverted doctrine led to impure life. See Jer. *Adv. Lucif.* p. 53; Epiphan. *Haer.* 23.

their doom idleth not, and their destruction drowseth not.[1] For if God spared not *angels* who sinned,[2] but, hurling them to Tartarus,[3] committed them to dens[4] of darkness, as reserved for judgment—and spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a herald of righteousness,[5] with seven others, bringing a sudden flood on the world of the impious; and calcining the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, condemned them with overthrow, having made them a warning for those who should hereafter be impious; and righteous Lot, utterly distressed by the wanton life of these offenders,[6] He rescued—for by sight and hearing the righteous man, dwelling among them day after day, was torturing his righteous soul with their lawless deeds—the Lord knoweth how to rescue the pious from trial, but to reserve the unrighteous, under punishment, for the day of judgment; and especially those who walk after the flesh in the lust of pollution, and despise dominion. Daring, self-willed, they tremble not when they rail at glories,[7] in cases wherein angels, greater though they are in strength and might,[8] do not bring against them[9] before the Lord a railing judgment. But these

1 *τὸ κρῖμα*, the sentence of judgment; *κρίσις*, the act. *Νυστάζει*, lit. nods," "*dormitat*" (Matt. xxv. 5).

2 Gen. vi. 2.

3 Ver. 4. *Ταρταρώσας*; a strange classic *hapax legomenon*. Tartarus is the Hebrew Gehinnom. St. Peter does not follow St. Jude in specifying the traditional sin of the angels; still his allusion is to Jewish tradition. Cf. Book of Enoch v. 16; x. 6; xiv. 4, etc. On such allusions see *Life of St. Paul*, i. 58, ii. 48—51, etc.

4 *Leg.*, *σειροῖς*, ℵ, A, B, C. Here again St. Peter substitutes a word of similar sound for *σειραῖς*, "chains," which may have been a variation of memory for Jude's *δεσμοῖς*. There is, however, an epic daring in the expression "*chains* of *darkness*;" "*fetter* of darkness" is found in Wisd. xvii. 17.

5 That Noah was a preacher was a natural Jewish inference (Jos. *Antt.* i. 3, § 1).

6 *ἀθέσμων*, implying that they violated the most sacred and natural laws.

7 *Glories*, that is, at "glorious beings."

8 "Fools rush in, where angels fear to tread."

9 This can only mean "against glories"—*i.e.*, against angelic dignities even after their fall—and the verse would be perfectly inexplicable without the allusion of Jude to Michael refraining to rail at Satan. He and the fallen angels were *δόξαι* once, just as they may still be called "angels." Compare Milton's—

> "Less than Archangel ruined, or excess
> *Of glory* obscured."

Unwilling to adduce Jude's reference to the dispute between Michael and

as mere irrational animals, born for capture and destruction,[1] railing in things which they know not, in their own corruption shall be utterly destroyed,[2] suffering wrong as the hire of doing wrong.[3] Thinking that luxuriousness in the day[4] is pleasure, spots[5] and blemishes, luxuriating in their own deceits[6] while they banquet with you, having eyes full of an adulteress,[7] and insatiable of sin, luring with a bait unstable souls, having a heart trained in covetousness, children of malediction! Abandoning the straight path they wandered, following in the path of Balaam the son of Bosor,[8] who loved the hire of wrongdoing, but received a rebuke for his own transgression: a dumb beast of burden[9] uttering a human voice checked the prophet's infatuation. These are waterless springs, and mists driven by a hurricane, for whom the mirk of darkness has been reserved. For uttering inflations of foolishness they lure with a bait[10] in the lusts of the flesh, in wantonness, those who

Satan about the body of Moses, which was only recorded by apocryphal writings from Jewish tradition, the writer makes the reference general, so that the reader who was familiar with the Old Testament would rather be reminded of Zech. iii. 1, 2.

[1] A sacrificial calf ran to Rabbi Judah and wept in his bosom. But "go," he said, "you were created for this purpose" (Babha Metsia. *f.* 85 a).

[2] The acceptance of Jude's words, and their application in a totally different sense, is very remarkable. St. Jude's language reads like a keen epigram; on the other hand, we have in St. Peter a remarkable play on the two senses of the word φθορὰ, viz., "corruption" and "destruction." v. *supra*, p. 201.

[3] *Leg.* ἀδικούμενοι, ℵ, B. The common text has κομιούμενοι, "about to carry off," A, C.

[4] *I.e.*, for life's brief day. "Voluptatem aestimantes diei delicias" (Vulg.).

[5] σπῖλοι, where Jude has σπιλάδες, "sunken reefs."

[6] ἀπάταις, ℵ, A. C., etc., for Jude's ἀγάπαις, "love feasts" (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 10).

[7] μοιχαλίδος (cf. Rev. ii. 20). But if the reading be right (for μοιχαλίας, ℵ, A,) the allusion is uncertain.

[8] St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 8), St. Peter, and St. John (Rev. ii. 14, &c.) alike allude to this false prophet as a type of false teachers in their own day. Bosor, perhaps a Galilean corruption of Beor (בְּעוֹר), with an intentional assonance (in the Jewish fashion, as in Jerubbe*sheth*, Kir *Heres*, Baal *Zebub*, &c., see *Life of Christ*, i. 456) to *Bashar*, "flesh."

[9] The New Testament writers, like the LXX., seem to avoid ὄνος, (ass) which led to Gentile jeers, and use the more euphemistic ὑποζύγιον.

[10] δελεάζουσιν, as in ver. 14; only found in Ja. i. 14.

were scarcely[1] escaping them who spend their lives in error,—promising them liberty, though being themselves slaves of corruption.[2] For by whatever any one has been worsted, by that has he also been enslaved. For if, after having escaped the pollutions of the world by full knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are worsted by being again entangled in them, the last things have become worse to them than the first.[3] For it had been better for them not to have fully known the way of righteousness, than, after fully knowing it, to swerve aside from the holy commandment delivered to them. But there has happened to them the fact of the true proverb, "The dog turning to his own vomit," and "A sow that had bathed to its wallowing-place of mire"[4] (ii. 1—22).

This is now, beloved, the Second Epistle I am writing to you, in both of which I am trying to arouse your sincere understanding, by reminding you,—that you may remember the words spoken before by the holy prophets, and the command of the Lord and Saviour, through your Apostles;[5] recognising this first, that there shall come at the end of the days scoffers in their scoffing, walking according to their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for from the day when the fathers fell asleep[6] all things are continuing as they now are, from the beginning of creation. For this they wilfully choose to forget—that there were heavens from of old, and earth composed out of water,

[1] *Leg.* ὀλίγως, A, B, &c.

[2] John viii. 34; Rom. viii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gal. v. 13 (Iren. *Haer.* xxi. 3). An old way with false teachers (Gen. iii. 5). Their argument was, that the Spirit was so supreme and etherial that indulgence of the flesh could not harm it.

[3] Matt. xii. 45.

[4] *Vs.* 22, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας. cf. τὸ τῆς συκῆς, Matt. xxi. 21. The language differs so much from Prov. xxvi. 11 that probably this is merely a current proverb (*leg.*, κύλισμα, ℵ, A, K, L).

[5] "*Your* Apostles"—*i. e.*, those who first preached to you. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 2.

[6] Cf. Mal. ii. 17; Ps. xlii. 4. The exact reference to "the fathers" is difficult to determine. It may mean those well-known Christian teachers and others (1 Thess. iv. 15) who, like St. James the elder, had died between A.D. 33 and A.D. 68. But it may naturally include the patriarchs and prophets to whom the promise came (Rom. ix. 5). St. Peter refutes this taunt about "*the status quo* of *the world*" (*a*) by the deluge of water, which shall be followed by the deluge of fire (5—7); and (*β*) by the difference between God's conception of time and man's (8—10).

and by means of water,[1] by the word of God, by means of which (water)[2] the then world being overwhelmed with water perished; but the present heavens and earth by this same word have been stored with treasuries of fire,[3] being reserved for the day of judgment and destruction of impious men. But do not *ye* forget this one thing, beloved, that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as *one* day.[4] The Lord is not tardy concerning His promise as some reckon tardiness, but is long-suffering towards you, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.[5] But the day of the Lord shall be upon us as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass hurtlingly away, and orbs of Heaven, being scorched,[7] shall be dissolved, and the earth and the works in it shall be burnt up.[8] Since, then, all these things are in course of being dissolved,[9] what kind of men ought ye to be in holy ways of life and piety, awaiting and hastening[10] the coming of the day of the Lord, because of which the heavens being

[1] The allusion seems to be to water, as the ὕλη, the matter out of which the world was made (as in Clem. *Hom.* xi. 24)—the *material* cause of the world, as Thales also thought;—and to water as also the *instrumental* cause (διατελικὸς) of the world, Gen. i. 6. Cf. Pss. xxiv. 2; cxxxvi. 6.

[2] Gen. vii. 11.

[3] Lit., "treasured with fire," alluding to the subterranean fires. But it may be "treasured up (*i. e.*, reserved) *for* fire." We find the same conception in the Book of Enoch, i. 6. See Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 9; Hippol. *Ref. Haer.* ix. 28.

[4] "The dial of the ages—the *aeoniologium*—differs from the horologe of time."—Bengel, Ps. xc. 4.

[5] His seeming delay is not delay, but mercy and forbearance (*Aufgeschoben nicht aufgehoben*): "*Patiens quia aeternus*" (Aug.). See Habbak. ii. 3; Ezek. xviii. 23, xxxiii. 11; Ecclus. xxxv. 22; Heb. x. 37; 1 Tim. ii. 4.

[6] ῥοιζηδόν, one of the Æschylean expressions (τεφρώσας, ταρταρώσας, ὑπέρογκα, λαῖλαψ, ζόφος, σειρὸς, &c.) of this Epistle.

[7] στοιχεῖα may mean the heavenly bodies, as in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 5 (Matt. xxiv. 29). Καυσοῦμαι is first found in Dioscorides, in the sense of feverish.

[8] ℵ, B, K read εὑρεθήσεται, "shall be found." This makes very dubious sense, unless the clause be interrogative. It had occurred to me, before I saw it remarked elsewhere, that it might be some accidental confusion with the Latin *urentur*.

[9] This is the *praesens futurascens*, the grand prophetic present which assumes the progressive realisation of the fixed decree.

[10] Just as the Jews believed that by faithful obedience to the Law they would speed the Advent of the Messiah (see *Life of St. Paul*, i. 65, 66).

set on fire shall be dissolved, and the scorching orbs of Heaven shall be melted?[1] But, according to His promise, we expect *new* heavens and a *new* earth, in which righteousness dwelleth.[2] Wherefore, beloved, since ye expect these things, give diligence, to be found spotless and blameless for Him in peace, and account as salvation the long-suffering of our Lord, even as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him,[3] wrote to you,[4] as also in all his epistles, speaking in them about these things;—in which are some difficulties which the unlearned and unstable distort, as also the rest of the Scriptures,[5] to their own perdition. Ye, then, beloved, knowing these things beforehand, be on your guard, lest, being carried away by the error of the lawless, ye fall away from your own steadfastness. But increase in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to Whom be the glory both now and unto the day of eternity.[6]

So—abruptly—the Epistle ends. There are no salutations, there is no benediction. The absence of the former is easily understood, because the letter was obviously intended to be Œcumenical in character; and perhaps this, or the indignant agitation which was shaking the heart of the writer, or even that share in the composition which I have supposed to belong to another, may also account for the absence of the blessing. No conclusion, it seems to me, can be drawn

[1] Is. xxxiv. 4; Mic. i. 4. [2] Is. xxxii. 16; lxv. 25. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 10.

[4] Even if it is assumed that this can only refer to letters addressed to Asia, we can still refer it to Rom. ii. 4, ix. 2 ("not knowing that the goodness of God is leading thee to repentance"), for it is nearly certain that the Epistle to the Romans was addressed, among other Churches, to Ephesus (see *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 170). The allusion to this Epistle would at once account for the remark that some things in St. Paul's writings were "hard to be understood." The doctrines of Freedom and Justification by Faith were peculiarly liable to ignorant and dangerous perversion, as St. Paul himself was well aware (Rom. iii. 8; v. 20; 1 Cor. vi. 12—20; Gal. v. 13—26). Others explain the reference by 1 Thess. iv. 13—v. 11, &c.

[5] The writings of Christian Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists would soon acquire a position on the same level as the Old Testament Scriptures. See Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

[6] "All Eternity is one Day."—(Estius.)

from this circumstance, either for or against the genuineness of the letter. But whether it be genuine or not, or genuine only in a partial and secondary sense, no one can read it without a recognition of its power, or without a conviction that the "grace of superintendency" was at work when, in the fourth century, it was finally admitted into the Canon of the Church.[1] We do not possess in it a letter of the intense and touching personal interest which attaches to the Second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, because it gives us far less insight into the writer's personal feelings, and because its absolute genuineness is not above suspicion; but if we do not hear in this Epistle, but rather in its predecessor, the last *words* of the great Apostle of the Circumcision, there is at least a reasonable probability that we hear the echo of some of his latest thoughts.

[1] I entirely disagree with Dr. Abbott in his very slighting estimate of the value of the Epistle. "In omnibus Epistolæ partibus," says Calvin, "spiritus Christi majestas se exserit."

CHAPTER XI.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE.

Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐῤῥωμένων λόγων.—ORIGEN (in Matt. xiii. 55).

THE authenticity of the brief but interesting Epistle of St. Jude is more strongly supported by external evidence than that of St. Peter. This circumstance alone tends to establish its priority of origin. It was indeed ranked by Eusebius, as were five of the Catholic Epistles, among the "disputed" books; but it was accepted by Tertullian,[1] Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, and Ephraem Syrus, and though absent from the Peshito, is recognised in the Muratorian Canon. This acceptance is the more remarkable, because in the brief space of twenty-five verses it presents so many peculiarities. It startled many Christian readers even in the first three centuries alike by its allusions to strange Jewish legends unauthorised by Scripture, and by its quotation from a book which was acknowledged to be apocryphal. On these grounds, as St. Jerome tells us, most men in his day rejected it, and the triumph of its canonicity over such prejudices can only have been due to the strong reasons for its acceptance. One of those reasons is the absence of any motive for a pseudonym so little known as that of Jude, and one which even in the early Church furnished no

[1] He is the earliest who mentions it. *De habit. mul.* 3.

certainty as to the identity of the writer. Apocryphal literature was busy from the first with the name of St. Peter;[1] and any one who wished to secure recognition for his own opinions by introducing them under the shadow of a mighty name, would also have had every temptation to give them the weight of authority which they would derive from the name of James, the Bishop of Jerusalem. But there existed no such reason for adopting the name of Jude. The Jude who was believed to have written this Epistle was not one of the Twelve Apostles. He is never expressly spoken of as an Apostle, even in the wider sense. His name is barely mentioned in the New Testament, and only mentioned at all in connexion with the unbelief which he shared with his three brothers during the years of our Lord's ministry, previous to that conversion which, as we may conclude from various indications, was effected by the overwhelming evidence for the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. So little, indeed, is known of St. Jude, that even tradition, which delights to furnish particulars respecting the Apostles and leaders of the early Church, is silent about him. Apart from a few uncertain inferences, no Christian legend, no pious martyrologist, no learned enquirer can tell us one single particular about the life, the labours, or the death of Jude. The only story in which his name occurs is the one told us by Hegesippus, and preserved in Eusebius. He says that Domitian's jealousy was excited by rumours that some of the earthly family of Him Whom Christians adored as the King of the

[1] Serapion—τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα . . . παραιτώμεθα (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i. 470). Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 3. We know that there was a "Gospel" and an "Apocalypse" of Peter.

Universe were still living in Palestine. Prophecies about the advent of a great kingdom which was to take its rise in the East had been prevalent in the days of Nero, and were not entirely set at rest by the elevation of Vespasian to the Empire from the command of the army in Syria. Timid from the sense of his own manifold crimes, Domitian determined to enquire into the matter, and ordered some of these "relations of the Lord," or Desposyni, as they were called, to be brought into his presence. They were grandsons of the "Jude the brother of James" who wrote this Epistle, and when Domitian ascertained that they only possessed a few acres of land, and saw that they filled no higher rank than that of peasants of Palestine, whose hands were horny with daily labour, he dismissed them to their homes unharmed and with disdain,[1]—content with their assurance that the kingdom of Christ was neither earthly nor of this world, but heavenly and angelical.[2]

I have here assumed that the author of this short Epistle was the person whom he describes himself as being—"Jude the brother of James." That Jude was not one of the Twelve may be regarded as certain. He does not profess to be an Apostle, and speaks of the Apostles as of a class to which he did not belong.[3] The only Apostle besides Judas Iscariot who bore that very common name was Judas (the son) of James,[4] surnamed Lebbæus or Thaddæus. But early tradition says that this Apostle laboured in Syria, and

[1] Hegesipp. *ap*. Euseb. iii. 20. They told Domitian that they only had between them about seven acres of land, which they farmed themselves.

[2] See Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* 196, and notes; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. § 52.

[3] Ver. 17, 18.

[4] Luke vi. 16.

died at Edessa; and if he had been the author, it would be impossible to account for that non-acceptance of his Epistle in the early Syrian Church which is proved by its absence from the Peshito Version.[1] But, besides this, when the writer calls himself "the brother of James" it is unanimously admitted that he can only mean one James—the James who, after the martyrdom of the son of Zebedee, was universally known throughout the Church—that "pillar" of the Church of Jerusalem who was the undisputed head of Judaic Christianity, and was distinguished as "the brother of the Lord."

I shall not here enter into the disputed question as to who were "the brethren of the Lord," at which I must again glance in speaking of the Epistle of St. James.

All that need here be said is, that Jude, though not an Apostle, was a brother of James, and therefore a brother—or, at least, a brother in common parlance—of the Lord. If it be asked why he does not give himself this title, the simplest answer is that neither does James. Those who had a right to it would be the least likely to employ it. None were so well aware as they that from the moment when Christ began His ministry His whole relations to them and to His Mother had been essentially altered. On more than one occasion, when they aspired to control His actions and direct His movements, He had tried to make clear to them that they must henceforth recognise the Divine mystery of His Being. He had even classed them as children of the world, whom it was

[1] The "Jude of James," who was one of the Twelve (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13), is called *a son of* James in Tyndale's, Cranmer's, and Luther's versions, and in the text of the Revised Version.

therefore impossible for the world to hate as it hated Him.[1] And if this was the case during His earthly ministry, how infinitely more was it the case after His Resurrection, and when He had ascended to the right hand of the Majesty on High! It was natural that the early Church should speak of those holy men—who, if they were not the sons of the Mother of Jesus, had at any rate been trained under the same roof with Him—as "the brethren of the Lord." It was still more natural that, knowing Him at last, and believing on Him after He had risen from the dead, they should themselves shrink from the adoption of a title which pointed to a partial and earthly relationship, of which they could not but feel themselves transcendently unworthy. As for the later term *adelphotheos*, or "brother of God," which arose to describe this relationship,[2] I believe that St. James and St. Jude would have repudiated it with indignant energy, as arising from a reckless confusion of earthly relationships and Divine mysteries. They could not prevent their fellow-Christians from speaking of them as the "brethren of the Lord," but scarcely even for purposes of identification would they have been willing to use such a title of themselves. Like St. Paul, they must have felt that though they had known "Christ after the flesh," yet henceforth they knew Him "after the flesh" no more. To have been, in any sense,

[1] John ii. 4 (I have shown, however, in the *Life of Christ* (i. 165) that neither these words, nor the address "Woman!" involved any of the harshness or want of the most delicate reverence which the English translation seems to imply); vii. 7; Luke xi. 28; Matt. xii. 50.

[2] It is found in the superscription of the cursive Manuscript *f*, Ἄλλος ἀδελφόθεος τάδ' Ἰούδας εὐσεβέεσιν, which also has γράμμα πρὸς Ἑβραίους Ιακώβου ἀδελφοθέου as a superscription to the Epistle of St. James.

brothers of Jesus of Nazareth in the humiliation of His earthly life gave them no right to speak of themselves authoritatively as brothers of the Eternal Son of God now sitting on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

On the other hand, nothing was more natural than that Jude should describe himself as "the brother of James." His object was to tell his readers who he was, and how they might distinguish him from thousands of other Jews who bore his name. He was personally unknown to all but a few. If he called himself "the brother of James," his identity would be recognised by all. He would have some influence as a brother of the great "Bishop" of Jerusalem, whose fame had spread through every community of the Christian Church, and whose authority, as a sort of Christian High-Priest, was recognised by the myriads of Jewish Christians[1] who still went up to the Holy City at the great yearly feasts.

Further than this we only know the single fact that St. Jude was married. This we learn from the curious anecdote of Hegesippus which I have quoted on a previous page. It gives us an interesting glimpse of the simplicity and poverty which continued to the last to be the earthly lot of those who were connected with the Holy Family of Nazareth; and it is the more interesting because it is the last glimpse of them afforded to us by either secular or sacred history. Hegesippus says that they lived till the days of Trajan, and perhaps implies that the race of the Desposyni ended with them.[2] This anecdote also accords with the

[1] Acts xxi. 20: πόσαι μυριάδες . . . Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων.

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20.

incidental allusion of St. Paul, which, in contradiction to Ebionite traditions, speaks of the brethren of the Lord as being not only married men, but even as travelling about with their wives or Christian sisters on various missions.[1]

In the latter allusion we can see the possibility of circumstances which may have called forth the Epistle of St. Jude. If he travelled as one of the early preachers of Christianity, many years could not have elapsed before he learnt by painful experience that it was possible to accept the profession of Christianity without any participation in the holiness which it required. The imaginative sentiment which dwells with rapture on the supposed perfection of the early Christian Church, is one which is cherished in defiance of history and Scripture. Hegesippus[2] says that till the days when Symeon, son of Clopas,[3] was Bishop of Jerusalem, the Church was a virgin, and that then "Thebuthis" began to introduce heresies because he had not been elected bishop. He is, however, probably taking a Hebrew word for a person. True Christians did indeed preach a standard of ideal holiness, and approached that standard in lives more noble and more innocent than any which the world had ever seen. But from the first the drag-net of the Church contained fish both bad and good, and from the first the tares sown by the enemy began to spring up thickly among the growing wheat. Many

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 5. "A sister, a wife," appears to mean, as it is rendered in the Revised Version, "a wife who is a believer."

[2] *Ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. For "Thebuthis," Rufinus has "Theobutes quidam"; see Routh, i. 237. It may be connected with קָאב, and may mean "filth."

[3] Rufinus has *Cleopas.*

of the converts had barely extricated themselves from the vices of the heathendom by which they were surrounded.[1] Some openly relapsed into pagan practices.[2] Others, as time went on, betrayed a Satanic ingenuity in making their spiritual freedom a cloak for their carnal lusts.[3] The Epistle to the Corinthians exhibits to us a Church of which the discipline was inchoate and the morality deplorable. The Epistle to the Colossians proves that there had been an influx of gnosticising heresies, which illustrated the fatal affinity of religious error to moral degradation. The Pastoral Epistles show that these germs of sinful practice and erroneous theory had blossomed with fatal rapidity. In the Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter we see perhaps still later developments of these tendencies. The former denounces the atrocities of conduct, the latter the audacities of opinion, which displayed themselves in men who, in the still tentative organisation of Christian discipline, and before the Church had perfected the bulwark of her episcopate, were by the outer world identified with Christians, and had crept in unawares among the faithful. If Jude in one of his mission journeys came into personal contact with any of these deadly hypocrites, and was brought face to face with their extending influence, we can well imagine that one one who had lived from childhood in a home of spotless purity, would have sat down in a flame of zeal to wrap such infamous offenders in the whirlwind of his

[1] This is even more apparent in the original of such passages as 1 Thess. iv. 6 and Eph. v. 3, than it is in the English version, where it is happily obscured by the rendering of πλεονεξία by "covetousness."

[2] See 1 Cor. v. 1—11; 2 Cor. xii. 21.

[3] 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gal. v. 13.

wrath. The anger of a pure-hearted Jew might sometimes burn against the heathen who knew not God; but here were *Christians*—Christians who claimed yet loftier privileges than Israel of old, Christians who had received a grander law and a diviner spirit, Christians who had been admitted into a holier sanctuary only to become guilty of a more heinous sacrilege! They were doing the deeds of darkness while they stood in the noon-day. They claimed higher prerogatives than the Jew, yet they lived in viler practices than the Gentile. The fulness of their knowledge aggravated the perversity of their ignorance; the depth of the abyss into which they had sunk was only measurable by the glory of the height from which they had fallen.

> "Oh, deeper dole,
> That so august a spirit, shrined so fair,
> Should, from the starry session of its peers,
> Decline to quench so bright a brilliancy
> In Hell's sick spume! Ah me, the deeper dole!"

Filled with the burning indignation which was inspired alike by the Law and by the Gospel, Jude determined to warn the infant Church against their perilous influence. It was his object to expose and to denounce them;—and he did not spare.

But though the intention of the Epistle, as he himself tells us, is thus distinct, we know nothing of the date at which it was written, or of the place from which it was sent, or of the Churches to which it was addressed. That it was written in Palestine, and addressed to Corinth or to Alexandria, are conjectures, which may be correct, but which rest on no adequate foundation. St. Jude merely addresses his warnings to faithful Christians. The notion that his

letter was dictated by animosity towards St. Paul or his followers, may be mentioned as a curiosity of criticism.[1] It is obvious that bad men, whether Paulinists or Judaists, might fall into grievous aberrations. Truths can always be distorted by headstrong partisans. There may have been nominal Paulinists—indeed, we know that there were[2]—who wrested St. Paul's language into the wicked inferences that we may sin in order that grace may abound; and that, since we are justified by faith, works are superfluous; or even, as we are told in modern revivalist hymns, that "works are deadly." But that Judaists were capable of heresies no less disastrous is proved by the way in which they and their adherents are addressed in St. Paul's Epistles.[3] There is no reason for asserting that the one class are here denounced more than the other; and how little St. Jude was likely to think of St. Paul with bitter feelings is happily, though most incidentally, revealed, not only by the analogous tone of St. Paul's own warnings, but also by the impress of the Epistle to the Romans on the form which St. Jude adopts for his final benediction. We reject the theories of M. Renan and the more extravagant followers of the school of Tübingen, not from any *à priori* views—for we know that in that epoch, as in all others, theological differences were wide and deep, and theological controversies, even between men of the

[1] Renan, who accepts many of the theories of the Tübingen School in the fullest development which they have received at the hands of Schwegler and Volkmar, sees in the Epistle of St. Jude one of those venomous compositions, full of deadly hatred, which he supposes to have been circulated through the Judæo-Christian communities by emissaries of St. James, to counteract the growing influence of St. Paul! See these views ably criticised by Ritschl, *Studien u. Krit.* 1861, p. 103 *ff.*

[2] Rom. iii. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 15.

[3] Gal. i. 9; v. 12; vi. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 20, &c.

Apostolic age, could be bitter and impassioned[1]—but we reject them because they rest on no foundation, and because they are contradicted by facts of which all can judge.

For purposes of exact comparison with the cognate paragraphs of the Second Epistle of St. Peter, it may be well to translate this letter also in a style more literal than that of our English Version, and then to consider the main problems which it presents. It is only by the aid of a literal translation that the English reader can really estimate the wide divergence of St. Jude's style from the ordinary style of the New Testament writers. In order that all may take in at a glance the affinity between this Epistle and the Second of St. Peter, I have here printed in italics those identical or closely analogous words and phrases which occur in both.

Jude, *a slave of Jesus Christ* and a brother of James, to them that are beloved in God the Father and have been *kept* for Jesus Christ,[2] being elect, mercy to you, and *peace*, and *love be multiplied.*[3]

Beloved,[4] in giving *all diligence* to write to you respecting our common salvation,[5] I felt a necessity to write at once[6] exhorting you to fight in protection[7] of the faith once for all *delivered to the saints.* For there *slank in*[8] certain persons[9] who have *long ago*

[1] Acts xv. 2. πολλὴ συζήτησις.

[2] See John xvii. 11. [3] Compare Eph. vi. 23.

[4] Only as an opening address in 3 John 2.

[5] Cf. ἰσότιμον πίστιν, 2 Pet. i. 1. Even where the *words* of the two writers are not identical there is often a close analogy between the meanings which the words express.

[6] γράψαι. The word previously used is γράφειν. The sudden change of tense certainly seems to imply that St. Jude had intended to write a more general letter, but felt compelled by the present necessity to write this immediate warning. [7] ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, *super-certare.*

[8] παρεισέδυσαν; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1, παρεισάξουσιν. Gal. ii. 4; παρεισάκτους, παρεισῆλθον.

[9] τινες and ἄνθρωποι are both depreciative (Gal. ii. 12).

been fore-described (in prophecy) as doomed for this *sentence*, impious men, changing the grace of our God into *wantonness*,[1] and *denying* the only *Master*, and our Lord *Jesus Christ*.[2] But I desire to *remind* you, *though ye know* all things, once for all,[3] that Jesus,[4] after saving a people from the land of Egypt, secondly *destroyed* such as believed not.[5]

And *angels*, those who kept not their own dignity,[6] but abandoned their proper habitation, he hath *kept*[7] *for the judgment* of the great *day* in everlasting *chains under mirky gloom*.[8] Even as *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, and the cities around them, giving themselves to fornication in like manner with these,[9] and going *after* strange *flesh*, are set forth as an *example*, undergoing a penalty of eternal fire.[10]

1 How prevalent was this dangerous possibility we see from 1 Cor. vi. 9—18; 1 John iii. 7—10; 2 Pet. ii.

2 Or "our only Lord and Master." ℵ, A, B, C omit θεόν; but probably (as in Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; Rev. vi. 10, &c.) δεσπότης refers to God, though it is used of Christ in 2 Pet. ii. 1.

3 *I.e.*, though ye have once for all received all necessary instruction in matters pertaining to salvation.

4 "Jesus" is the more difficult, and therefore more probable. reading of A, B. It is explained by 1 Cor. x. 4, and the identification of the Messiah with the "Angel of the Lord" (Ex. xiv. 19; xxiii. 20, &c.) and with the Pillar of Fire in Philo.

5 "Whose carcases fell in the wilderness" (Heb. iii. 17).

6 Vulg., *principatum.*

7 τετήρηκεν. I cannot see any intentional play of words here, though it is in contrast with the τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας.

8 ζόφος is the word used by Hesiod of the imprisoned Titans (*Theogon.* 729). 'Αΐδιος is stronger than αἰώνιος in the conception of permanence, yet, as we see here, it is used for a limited period, viz., εἰς κρίσιν μ. ἡμ., and in Enoch, to which Jude is referring, we find "Bind them *for seventy generations* under the earth until the day of judgment." (See Enoch xii. 4, xiv. 5, xv. 3, xxi. 10, &c.). I do not think it needful to enter into curious enquiries how these fallen angels, if kept in chains, dwell in the air and go about tempting men (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12), or whether the tempting spirits are a different class from the fallen angels. See Excursus on the Book of Enoch and Rabbinic allusions of St. Jude.

9 Clearly "*with these angels*." To refer it to Sodom and Gomorrha as though it were "Even as Admah and Zeboim *like Sodom and Gomorrha*," or "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, in like manner with these ungodly Christians," is to introduce impossible explanations in order to get rid of St. Jude's plain intimation that he, like the Jews of his day, attributed the fall of the angels to sensuality.

10 See 3 Macc. ii. 5, where the words are closely parallel; so, too,

Yet, notwithstanding, in like manner, these persons also in their dreamings defile the flesh,[1] and set *lordship* at naught, and *rail at glories.*[2] But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses,[4] *dared not*[5] *bring*

ὑπέχειν, unknown to the N. T., is found in 2 Macc. iv. 48. The fire of retribution which destroyed the Cities of the Plain burnt but for a day; but it is called *æonian*, or *eternal*, because the smoking ruin of it remains (comp. Wisd. x. 7), and because it is the fire of God's retributive wrath which burns eternally against unrepented sin. "*Æonian*" expresses *quality*, not *duration*. Libanius uses the same expression, in the same meaning, of the fire which burnt Troy.

[1] See Is. lvi. 10 (LXX.). They are dreamers because they take the substance for the shadow and the shadow for the substance, and their dreamy speculations are mixed up with immoral practices.

[2] What "glories" are meant is very uncertain. Wiesinger and Huther explain it of *evil* angels, as the context seems to imply. There is no trace of any early sect of heretics (whether in *conduct*, as those spoken of by St. Jude, or in *teaching*, as those spoken of by St. Peter) railing at angels, but rather the reverse (Col. ii. 18). In Enoch vi. 4 we read, "Ye calumniate [God's] greatness;" and in xli. 1, "The sinners who denied *the Lord of glory;*" and in xlv. 2, "Who deny the Name of the *Lord of Spirits;*" and in i. 8, "*The splendour of the Godhead* shall illuminate them." But we can hardly imagine that any who *blasphemed God* would be suffered to remain even nominal members of the Christian community. Immorality, however flagrant, would not necessarily exclude them from Churches of which the discipline was lax or weak, as we see not only from 1 Cor. v. 2, but also from the warnings which St. Paul finds it necessary to utter to even faithful communities. We see, however, from 1 Cor. xii. 3 that in the wild abuses of the "Tongues" some even dared to say "Anathema be Jesus!" See my *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 56.

[3] "Archangel" only in 1 Thess. iv. 16 (Dan. xii. 1, LXX.). Michael—"the merciful, the *patient*, the holy Michael" (Enoch xl. 8)—only in Dan. x. 13; Rev. xii. 7. Origen says that the allusion is taken from an apocryphal book called *The Ascension of Moses* (*De Princ.* iii. 2). See Rampf, *Der Brief Juda.* In Targ. Jonath. on Deut. xxxiv. 6 he is the guardian of the grave of Moses.

[4] The Scriptural account of the death of Moses is very simple, but the Jews had many legends about it; especially how he—

"Died of the kisses of the lips of God."

The Angel of Death dared not take his life, and so God drew away his soul with a kiss. One legend was that Satan claimed his body as "lord of matter" (ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζοντι). Œcumenius says he claimed the body because Moses had murdered the Egyptian.

[5] Why "*dared* not?" The entire reasoning shows that the answer is

against him a *railing judgment*,[1] but said, The Lord rebuke thee ![2] But these *rail about such matters as they know not*,[3] and such things as they understand[4] *naturally, like the irrational animals*, in these they *corrupt* themselves.[5] Woe to them, because they went in the *way of* Cain,[6] and *poured themselves forth* in the *error* of *Balaam for hire*, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah.[7] These are the *sunken reefs*[8] in your *love feasts*,[9] *banqueting with you* fearlessly,[10] pasturing themselves ;[11] *waterless clouds*,[12] *swept hither and thither by winds*,[13] autumn-withering trees,[14] *fruitless*, twice dead,[15] deraci-

"Because of Satan's former greatness." It can hardly be because the language of stern denunciation should never be used, seeing that Jude himself is here using it in the most impassioned form. In the Catena is a strange story that Satan, seeing Moses at the Transfiguration, taunted Michael with the violation of God's oath that Moses should not enter Canaan.

[1] Literally, "dared not bring against him a judgment of railing."

[2] The very words used by the Angel to the Accuser in Zech. iii. 1—3.

[3] This shows that the "railing" of these impious men was employed against spiritual or celestial beings of some kind. We have no materials for entering into further details.

[4] The E. V. does not keep up the distinction between οἴδασι and ἐπίστανται.

[5] See on 2 Pet. ii. 12 *supra*, pp. 201, 215.

[6] The allusion to Cain is obviously to the Cain of Jewish *hagadoth*, for St. Jude can hardly be charging these teachers with murder (see Excursus).

[7] "Gainsaying," Heb., Meribah ; Numb. xx. 13, "the water of strife" (LXX., ἀντιλογίας).

[8] σπιλάδες, αἱ ὕφαλοι πέτραι, *Etym. Magn.* In 2 Pet. ii. 13, σπῖλοι, "spots."

[9] *Agapae* are mentioned under that name in this place alone.

[10] Perhaps συνευωχούμενοι refers to some such insolent selfish greed as that of the rich Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 21); ἀφόβως, not fearing either the rebuke of Presbyters (who are themselves afraid in poor communities to do their duty) or the consequences which they may bring upon themselves (1 Cor. xi. 30).

[11] Ez. xxxiv. 1, "Woe to the shepherds that feed themselves."

[12] Prov. xxv. 14; "carried about by every wind of doctrine," Eph. iv. 14.

[13] Here St. Peter's "being driven by a hurricane" is the more energetic phrase. The metaphors and expressions are here as Æschylean as St. Peter's, *e.g.*, ἐπαφρίζοντα ; cf. Æsch. *Ag.* 1067.

[14] "Spätherbstliche." Grot. *frugiperdae*.

[15] "*Twice* dead," merely a proverbial expression for "utterly dead," as in "*Bis* qui cito," and "Pro quo *bis* patiar *mori*."

nated;[1] wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shames;[2] wandering stars, *for which the mirk of darkness has been reserved for ever.* Yea, and with reference to them[3] did Enoch, the seventh from Adam,[4] prophesy, saying, "Lo, the Lord came, among His saintly myriads, to execute judgment against all, and to convict all the *impious* about all the deeds of their impiety which they *impiously did*, and about all the hard things which they spake against Him, impious sinners as they are. These are murmurers, blamers of their destiny,[5] *walking according to their lusts;* and their mouth utters *inflated things*, admiring persons *for the sake of advantage.*[6]

But ye, *beloved, remember the things spoken before by the Apostles* of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they used to tell you, that, *in the last time* there shall be *scoffers, walking according to their own*

[1] ἐκριζωθέντα. I take the unique equivalent from Shakespeare—

"Rend and *deracinate*
The unity and wedded calm of states."

[2] Is. lvii. 20.

[3] Or, "to these *also*" (as well as to others).

[4] We should say the *sixth*, but the Jews counted inclusively. The only object in mentioning this is the mystic significance of the number seven. Thus the Jews spoke of Moses as the seventh from Abraham; of Phinehas as the seventh from Jacob, &c. In Enoch xii.—xvi. the prophet is sent on a mission to the Fallen Angels. They fell from Heaven to earth, he was exalted from earth to Heaven (Iren. *Haer.* iv. 2, 16). See Excursus, "The Book of Enoch."

[5] μεμψίμοιροι, "blamers of their own lot." Philo, *Vit. Mos.* i. 33, Καὶ πάλιν ἤρξαντο μεμψιμοιρεῖν, "and they began again to blame their lot." Theophrastus, *Eth. Char.* xvii., περὶ μεμψιμοιρίας, "discontent following in the wake of self-indulgence."

[6] θαυμάζειν πρόσωπα, a Hebrew phrase: comp. προσωπολήπτης, Acts x. 34. In Gen. xix. 21, "Lo! I have accepted thee," the LXX. render ἰδού, ἐθαύμασά σου τὸ πρόσωπον. The best comment is in the words of Shakespeare—

"And not a man *for being simply man*
Hath any honour, but honour for those honours
Which are without him, as place, riches, favour,
Prizes of accident as oft as merit."

And as to the *cause* which St. Jude assigns for this partiality—

"*Plate sin with gold*
And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks."

lusts, of impieties.[1] These are the separatists,[2] egotistical,[3] not having the spirit. But ye, *beloved,* building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto life eternal. And some, indeed, try to convict of error when they dispute with you;[4] and try to save some, snatching them from the fire;[5] and pity some in fear,[6] hating even the tunic that has been *spotted*[7] by the *flesh.*

Now to Him that is able to guard you[8] unstumbling, and to set you before His glory *blameless* in exultation, to the only God[9] our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, *majesty,* might,

[1] Ἐμπαῖκται, Is. iii. 4 (LXX.). Warnings against such apostates, blasphemers, and ungodly men must have occurred often in the teachings of the Apostles (see Acts xx. 29; 1, 2 Thess.; Col. i. ii.; Tim.; Tit.; Rev., *passim*). It seems a most idle argument to refer this prophecy to 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, and thence to assume the priority of that Epistle!

[2] The word is only found in Arist. *Polit.* iv. 4, § 13. Separatists = Pharisees. But here the Pharisaism is Antinomian and apostate (Hooker, *Serm.* v. 11).

[3] ψυχικοί, "egotistical." If this rendering be not accepted, there is nothing for it but to naturalise the word "*psychical*" as a translation of this word. It expresses those who live in accordance with the mere natural views of a limited and selfish life. They are not *necessarily* "carnal"—*i.e.*, devoted to the basest fleshly impulses (σαρκικοί)—nor have they become "spiritual" (πνευματικοί). They live the common life of men in simple worldliness, and the slightly expanded egotism of domestic selfishness.

[4] Read for ἐλεᾶτε or ἐλεεῖτε (which spoil the continuity of the structure), ἐλέγχετε, A, C, which can only be fully rendered by "try to convict of error;" διακρινομένους, ℵ, A, B, C, see ver. 9 for the meaning of the word. Elsewhere it means "doubting" (Acts x. 20, Ja. i. 6, &c.).

[5] Zech. iii. 2, "Is not this a brand plucked from the burning?" (Am. iv. 1.)

[6] *Leg.*, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, ℵ, A, B. The omission of this clause by the E.V. (following K, L) spoils the triple structure. The *first* class of these impious men is to be refuted in argument; the *second* to be saved by vigorous personal influence and exertion; the *third*, which is the most obstinate and degraded class, shun, for fear they should defile and corrupt you; yet pity them in Christian love.

[7] ἐσπιλωμένον (comp. Rev. iii. 4, οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν).

[8] αὐτοὺς for ὑμᾶς is the *difficilior lectio*, but as it is only found in A, it may be a mere slip. The doxology evidently recalls Rom. xvi. 25.

[9] The word "wise," omitted in ℵ, A, B, C, &c., is probably interpolated from Rom. xvi. 27.

and *power* before all the æon,[1] and *now*, and to all the æons. *Amen.*

I. The style of the Greek—which was no doubt the language in which this letter was originally written—is exactly such as we should expect from one to whom Greek was not so familiar as his native Aramaic, but who still writes with a passion which gives force and eloquence to his words. It is the language of an Oriental who knows Greek, partly by reading and partly by having moved among Hellenistic communities, but whose vocabulary is far richer and more powerful than his grammar.[2] The words are Greek words, and sometimes rare, forcible, and poetic; but the whole colouring and tone of thought recall the manner of the Hebrew prophets, in whose writings St. Jude must have been trained during his youth in the humble and faithful house of Joseph at Nazareth.

The most remarkable trace of this Hebraic structure is shown in the extraordinary fondness of the writer for *triple arrangements*. In pausing to tell us that Enoch was the *seventh* from Adam he at once shows his interest in sacred numbers, and throughout his Epistle he has scarcely omitted a single opportunity of throwing his statements into groups of three. Thus

[1] *I. e.*, "as it was in the beginning."

[2] The number of the *hapax legomena* is remarkable, and some of them are full of picturesqueness and force—*e.g.*, ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, παρεισέδυσαν, ἐκπορνεύσασαι, ὀπίσω σαρκός, ὑπέχουσαι, φυσικῶς, ἐξεχύθησαν, ἀγάπαις, σπιλάδες, φθινοπωρινά, ἐπαφρίζοντα, πλανῆται, γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, πρόσωπα, διορίζοντες, ἀπταίστους, πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, besides others which are only found here and in 2 Peter, or are exceedingly rare in the New Testament. The semi-poetic colouring of these words is a phenomenon often observable in writers who are using a foreign language. "The diction," says Davidson, "is round and full, not neat or easy, but rather harsh. It shows one acquainted with Greek, yet unable to express his ideas in it with ease."—*Introduction to New Testament*, i. 450.

those whom he addresses are sanctified, kept, elect,[1] and he wishes them mercy, love, peace;[2] the instances of divine retribution are the Israelites in the wilderness, the fallen angels, and the Cities of the Plain;[3] the dreamers whom he denounces are corrupt, rebellious, and railing;[4] they have walked in the way of Cain, Balaam, and Korah;[5] they are murmurers, discontented, self-willed; they are boastful, partial, greedy of gain;[6] they are separatists, egotistic, unspiritual.[7] Lastly, they are to be dealt with in three classes, of which one class is to be refuted in disputation, another saved by effort, and the third pitied with detestation of their sins.[8] But saints are to pray in the spirit, keep themselves in the love of God, and await the mercy of Christ;[9] and glory is ascribed to God before the past, in the present, and unto the farthest future.[10]

Some of these triplets—those, for instance, in the twenty-third and last verses—are missed, in consequence of the adoption by the English Version of inferior readings; but as regards the rest, even if we might otherwise suppose that some of them were accidental, the recurrence of this arrangement no less than eleven times in twenty-five verses is obviously intentional, or, at any rate, characteristic of the writer's mode of thought. It could not be paralleled from any other passage of Scripture of equal length.[11] It is unlike anything which we should find in classic Greek, and accords with the professed authorship by indicating the Hebraic tinge of the writer's mind. We shall notice

[1] Ver. 1. [2] Ver. 2. [3] Vers. 5—7. [4] Ver. 8.
[5] Ver. 11. [6] Ver. 16. [7] Ver. 19. [8] Vers. 22, 23.
[9] Ver. 20. [10] Ver. 25.

[11] There is something which partially resembles it in the half-rhythmic triplets of Eph. v. 14.

hereafter that a similar antithetic balance and rhythmic flow is characteristic of the style of St. John. In both of these sacred writers it is the result of their Semitic origin and Jewish education.

2. But a far more remarkable characteristic of the writer is his fondness for alluding to remote and unrecorded incidents of Jewish tradition. In the brief space of nine verses he introduces current Rabbinic views in a manner to which, in the New Testament, there is scarcely a parallel. He accepts, for instance, the strange notion respecting the fall and fate of the angels through fleshly lusts. Alone of the New Testament writers, except St. John in the Apocalypse, he mentions and names an Archangel.[1] He introduces, probably from the apocryphal *Ascension of Moses*,[2] a personal contention between this Archangel and the Devil about the body of Moses, to which there is not in Scripture the remotest allusion.[3] He tells us that Michael "did not dare" to bring a "judgment of railing" against the Evil Spirit. He refers to Cain in a manner which seems to imply something more than the murder of Abel. He makes a quotation, which has since been discovered in a book confessedly apocryphal.[4] How are we to explain these peculiarities? Do they need any apologetic treatment?

[1] In the Apocryphal books and the Talmud we read of seven Archangels—Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel, Sealthiel, Jeremeel, and Sammael.

[2] Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως. See Hilgenfeld, *Mess. Jud.* lxxii. He may, however, be merely introducing the Jewish legend in his own way. (See Lieffert in Herzog. *R. Enc.*, s. v.)

[3] Schöttgen, Meuschen, and others adduce in exact parallel to this, that in the Jalkut Reubeni (f. 43, 3) there is a contest between Michael and Satan about Isaac and the ram. In Hilgenfeld's *Messias Judaeorum*, p. 461, various fragments are quoted of the *Ascension of Moses*, from which the reference was taken. (Orig. *De Princip.* iii. 2, § 1; see, too, Œcumenius *ad loc.*; Cramer's *Catena*, p. 160.)

[4] Jude 14.

There are two ways of treating them, which I shall content myself with stating, leaving every reader of unbiassed mind and fearless sincerity to choose between them.

i. There are many writers who endeavour by various explanations to minimise whatever contradicts their theories of "verbal dictation," and who insist that every allusion which cannot be explained out of the Old Testament must be accepted as a literal fact divinely revealed to St. Jude himself. It would, indeed, be a matter of no small difficulty to accept the Jewish legend that angels fell from their heavenly dignity by sensual impurities with mortal women. Hence these writers interpret the "sons of God" in Gen. vi. 2 to mean men of the righteous race, and they suppose that the "giants" in that passage were the offspring of inter-marriages between the race of Seth and the race of Cain.[1] They therefore explain St. Jude's allusion as a reference to the expulsion of Satan's angels from Heaven because of their revolt,—a notion very familiar to us from Milton's Epic, but of which there are in Scripture only the dimmest and most disputable traces. They take it as a divinely revealed fact that the body of Moses was really an object of personal contention between the Archangel Michael and the Devil, and they boldly conjecture that Satan desired to seize the body that he might induce the Jews to treat it as a relic to be worshipped.[2] Lastly, although the

[1] As was done even by St. Augustine. See, too, Milton, *Paradise Lost*, xii. 580, *seq*.

[2] Philippi supposes that the fact was revealed to the disciples, to account for the appearance of Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration. Of what use are such conjectures?

prophecy attributed to Enoch really does occur in almost the same words in the apocryphal book of that name—and although it is certain that the book in whole or in part existed in St. Jude's time—they refuse to admit that St. Jude could have used a quotation from a book confessedly apocryphal, but assume either that he received this particular passage "by independent revelation;"[1] or that it was a genuine prophecy of the antediluvian prophet correctly handed down by tradition for two thousand five hundred years;[2] or, lastly, that the writer or interpreter of the Book of Enoch borrowed it from St. Jude, and not St. Jude from him.

ii. To others the rare phenomena of the Epistle present no difficulty which requires such a congeries of harsh suppositions—suppositions which, in their opinion, need no refutation, because they rest on no basis. They do not think it necessary to support the authority of this certainly canonical, but as certainly non-apostolic, writer by hypotheses so extraordinary. They know that at this epoch Apocryphal literature was widely current among the Jews, and that a dense multitude of Rabbinic legends had sprung up around their early literature and history. Many of these are of an absurd and objectionable character, and they see a superintending guidance in the wisdom which excludes all trace of these from the sacred page. Every Jewish Christian, trained in the lore of Palestine, would be familiar with many such Hagadoth; and it was perfectly

[1] "Apostolum Henochi verba ex singulari divina revelatione habuisse." —Pfeiffer, *Decas*, iv. § 8.

[2] See "Enoch Restitutus: An attempt to separate from the Books of Enoch the book quoted by St. Jude," by Rev. E. Murray, 1838.

natural that in writing to his countrymen St. Jude should refer to such beliefs by way of passing illustration, just as St. Paul refers to the traditional names of the Egyptian magicians,[1] and to the legend of the wandering rock.[2]

St. Jude's quotation from the apocryphal Book of Enoch[3] no more stamps the book of Enoch, or the passage quoted from it, as a Divine revelation than do St. James's references to the *Wisdom of Solomon*, or St. Paul's quotations from Epimenides, Aratus, or Menander. From those pagan writers, and even from the last—deeply dyed as he was with the vicious morality of a decadent age—St. Paul quotes without hesitation a religious truth, or moral aphorism, or historical allusion which happens to illustrate his general purpose. It is in no wise strange that St. Jude should make analogous use of the Book of Enoch and the *Ascension of Moses*, which were current among the Hebraists whom he was addressing, and whose views he shared. Some have supposed that he used them because they were accepted by those against whom he is writing, and because any consideration derived from these would have the force of an *argumentum ad hominem*. It seems to be a more

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[2] 1 Cor. x. 4. See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 48, 638.

[3] The direct quotation is in Jude 14, 15, but there are several other traces of St. Jude's acquaintance with the book; for instance, the pseudo-Enoch, no less than Jude, refers to "wandering stars" (xviii. 14, 16; xxi. 3), and comes near the very remarkable expression "chains of darkness" (Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 5; "Bind Azazel . . . cast him into darkness" (xii. 5—7); "Fetters of iron without weight" (liii. 3). Hofmann and Philippi try to prove that the Book of Enoch was written by a Jewish Christian. Locke, Ewald, Weiszäcker, Dillmann, Köstlin, &c., only admit later interpolations of a Jewish book.

natural supposition that he alluded to current conceptions for a particular object, just as all writers do in all ages, without entering into any discussion as to their literal truth.

Such are the conflicting opinions of different commentators. They affect questions which lie in that neutral region of uncertainty where all true Christians should respect their common freedom. They touch on questions of literature and criticism. They hinge upon definitions of inspiration which the Scriptures themselves do not furnish, and which the Church has in consequence withheld. They may be safely left to the influence of time, and the widening thoughts of mankind. All that we need say respecting them is, "Let there be in things necessary unity; in things doubtful liberty; in *all* things charity."

iii. If we ask, lastly, who were the evil-doers against whom the parallel denunciations of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter were hurled—St. Jude exposing their unnatural wickedness and blaspheming presumption, the Second Epistle dwelling mainly on their corrupting influence and specific faithlessness—the answer is that neither of the sacred writers is dealing with a definite sect, but that the errors and malpractices which they denounce afterwards came to a head in the mysteries of iniquity which characterised *many* sects. These errors contained the germ of the systems which were subsequently known as Antinomian Gnosticism. Very shortly after the period with which we are dealing, the Nicolaitans drew on themselves the indignant anathemas of St. John. The second century saw the rise of other defilers of the Christian name and profession. Such were the

Ophites, who lauded the Serpent of Paradise as their benefactor;[1] the blasphemous Cainites, who made their heroes out of all the vilest characters mentioned in the Old Testament;[2] the Carpocratians, who taught licentious communism;[3] the Antitactae, who regarded it as a duty to the Supreme God to violate all the commandments, on the ground that they had been promulgated by His enemy the Demiurgus;[4] the Adamites, who taught men to live like brutes.[5] None of these sects as yet existed *as sects*, but in the wild opinions attributed to Nicolas and Cerinthus we see the seething elements of reckless speculation which sprang from a common fountain, but under the subsequent name of Gnosticism split into the two opposite streams of a reckless immorality and an extravagant asceticism.[6]

[1] Iren. *Haer.* i. 30, § 5.

[2] Epiphan. *Haer.* xxxviii. 2.

[3] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 2; Theodoret, *Haer.* i. 6.

[4] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 4.

[5] Epiphan. *Haer.* lii.

γάρ τοι ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν διδάσκουσιν ἢ τὸ ὑπέρτονον ἄγουσαι ἐγκράτειαν (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 5, § 40).

Book III.

APOLLOS AND ALEXANDRIAN CHRISTIANITY AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Book III.

APOLLOS AND ALEXANDRIAN CHRISTIANITY AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER XII.

JUDAISM, THE SEPTUAGINT, AND ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCES.

"Alexandria . . . vertex omnium civitatum."
Amm. Marcell. xxii. 16.

THE Christian Faith does not centre in a Dogma, or in a Book, but in a Person, and this is the cause and pledge of its essential unity. Its one answer to all who, with the Philippian jailer, ask, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" is the answer of Paul and Silas, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." That truth was clearly seen by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he began his magnificent sketch of Christian theology with the pregnant words, "God, Who fragmentarily and multifariously of old spake to our fathers by the Prophets, at the end of these days spake unto us by His Son."

But unity does not exclude diversity—nay, more, without diversity there can be no true and perfect unity. Where there is no unity there is distraction, but where there is no diversity there is death. Where the spirits of the prophets are not subject to the prophets—where every man is conscious only of his

own invisible consecration—where, as in the Church of Corinth, every one in his fanatical egotism is anxious to shout down the truths revealed to others, that he may absorb the attention of all by his own "tongue," however barbarous, however dissonant, however unintelligible—where it is ignored that amid the diversities of gifts and ministrations there is yet the translucent energy of one and the same Spirit—*there* is confusion, and railing, and irreligious strife. And where, on the other hand, all lips mechanically repeat the same shibboleth for centuries after its significance has been worn away—where the dulness of a self-styled "orthodoxy" has obliterated the many hues of the wisdom of God—where enquiry is crushed under the heel of authority—where, in fact, there can be *no* independent enquiry because all conclusions are dictated beforehand by the tyranny of an usurped infallibility—*there* is uniformity indeed, but therewith corruption and decay. When it is persecution to alter the perspective of a doctrine, and death to leave the cart-rut of a system—when they who question the misinterpretations of Scripture which have been pressed into the service of popular errors, must face the anger of startled ignorance—when there is no life left save the spark which glows in the ashes of the Martyr, or the lamp which flickers in the Reformer's cell—then the caste which has seized the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven may boast indeed of unity, but it is the unity produced by selfishness in the few, and serfdom in the many. The unity so secured is but the stagnancy of the unrippled water, the monotony of the barren sands. It is the unity of the dead plain, "where every molehill is a mountain, and every

thistle a forest tree." In this latter condition there is a deadlier peril than in the former. Even discords can be inwrought into the vast sequences of some mighty harmony, but what great music can be achieved with but a single note? Unbroken unanimity may be the boast of a deadening Buddhism, a withered Confucianism, a mechanical Islam; it cannot exist in a free and living Christianity. If it exist at all, it can only be as a uniformity of indifference and ignorance —a uniformity of winter and of night. The uniformity of the noonday is only for the Infinite. For finite beings, if there be any light at all, there must be the colours of the sunset, and the sevenfold lustre of the rainbow, which is only seen when there is rain as well as sun.

> "Only the prism's obstruction shews aright
> The secret of a sunbeam, breaks its light
> Into the jewelled bow from blankest white;
> So may a glory from defect arise."[1]

Hence, as we have seen again and again in the books of the Old Testament, the truth which they reveal comes to us tinged with the individuality of the writers. It comes to us unchanged, indeed, in its essence, because that essence is unchangeable, but still reflected and refracted by the medium through which it has inevitably passed. The Light of Heaven, like the light of day, *can* only reach us through earthly media. The sunlight—lest it should blind us with its brightness—must pass through the atmosphere with its layers of vapour visible and invisible; it must glance from a myriad surfaces; it must fire the mountain tops and blaze upon the sea, and be

[1] Browning.

coloured by the evening clouds. And yet wherever it falls, however it is modified, it is always beneficent—and even more beneficent from the changes to which it is subjected—because it is the sunlight still. And in the same way, to suit our finite capacities, the Light of Heaven also must pass through human subjectivities. It must display blessed varieties of hue, and graduated intensities of radiance, according as it comes to us through the mind of a Moses or of an Isaiah, of a St. James or a St. Paul. But of itself it can never lead astray, because it is light from Heaven. The mystic light which, as Jewish legend tells us, gleamed over the oracular gems of Aaron's breastplate, was ardent now with the azure of the sapphire, now with the deep green of the emerald, now with the softer lustre of the amethyst. Even so does the light of inspiration alternately blaze or glow in the fiery heart of the Apostle of the Gentiles, in the loving tenderness of St. John the Divine, in the stern and lofty morality of St. James, the brother of the Lord.

Nor is it otherwise with the truths proclaimed by different communities. Churches, too, have their modifying subjectivity. The Spirit of God that spake of old in the prophets is the Spirit of Christ which speaks in His prophets now. "*Vox quidem dissona, sed una relligio.*" The voices are many, the utterance is one. Churches differ as individuals differ. There were differences of view, differences of perspective, differences of characteristic expression in the Churches of Africa and of Palestine, in the schools of Alexandria and Antioch, in the Churches of the East and of the West. Christianity in all Churches was, and ever must be, in its essence Catholic—one and indivisible; yet

Christians shared in all minor matters the varying views of the bodies to which they belonged. There is but one *flock* of Christ, but there are many *folds*. The Christians of Egypt were not absolutely identical in the colour of their theology with those of Ephesus, nor the Christians of Ephesus with those of Rome.

Uniquely great and memorable was the work of the Church of Alexandria. The Christian School of Alexandria was deeply influenced by the views and traditions of the Jewish schools from which it sprang. To those schools it was affiliated by an unbroken course of historical events. I will endeavour, therefore, to furnish here a swift and summary view of the origin and character of ALEXANDRIAN CHRISTIANITY, which may at least serve to render more distinct the special character of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The Jews, tenaciously as they have always clung to their national peculiarities, have yet shown a remarkable power of adapting themselves, within certain limits, to the civilisation and tone of thought of the age and country in which their lot has been cast. But there has never been any modification of Judaism so remarkable as that which arose in Alexandria when Jewish religion first came into contact with Greek philosophy. Thus did the House of Bondage of their fathers become for the later Jews a School of Wisdom.[1]

If the bringing of East and West into closer contact with each other was one of the main works of Alexander the Great, the deepest mark which he left on the history of the world was his founding of Alexandria.

[1] Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iii. 26.

Jewish Hellenism—the utterance of Oriental thought in Greek language, and the interchange of Asiatic and Greek conceptions—was the result of Alexander's conquests, and of the policy which directed them; and this fusion went on more rapidly in Alexandria than in any other part of the Macedonian Empire.

Alexandria was a city which had the most splendid advantages. The fleets of Asia and Europe met in a commodious harbour, whose entrance was lighted by the Pharos, which has given its name to every lighthouse in the world.[1] Unlike the majority of ancient cities, it was built upon a regular plan, and was magnificently adorned with public buildings and works of art. Its climate was healthy; it was well supplied with pure water by noble aqueducts; its market was a meeting-place for traffickers from every region of the civilised globe. The mixture of various nationalities in an important city always tends to quicken the thoughts of men. Oriental theosophy, Greek culture, philosophic speculations, found their way among the citizens as surely as the sailors of the ships which came to anchor behind the Pharos. Even Theodorus the Atheist was welcomed at the Court of the Ptolemies.[2] Alexandria seethed with intellectual excitement.[3] There was an incessant conflict and rivalry between the Egyptian, Greek, and Jewish elements of the populace, which in later times could barely be kept in order by the rough authority of Roman Proconsuls. But besides the natural sharpening of the

[1] Μέγιστον ἐμπορεῖον τῆς οἰκουμένης (Strabo).

[2] Diog. Laert. ii. 102.

[3] Εἰς ἣν καὶ ἡ πανταχόθεν συνεῤῥεῖ νεοτὴς τῶν περὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐσπουδακότων (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. Greg. Thaumat.*).

intellect which resulted from the contact of opposite religions, the Ptolemies had made it their object to be patrons of literature, and the royal library of Alexandria furnished an unique opportunity for earnest students.

A circumstance which exercised no small influence over the development of Alexandria was the equality of civil rights which the Jews had from the first enjoyed. Alexander the Great had been most favourably impressed by his interview with the high-priest Jaddua.[1] Whatever may be thought of the legendary details of that interview, it is certain that he had spared the Jews from any exactions, and had accorded to them exceptional privileges. His policy was followed by the astute dynasty of the Lagidæ, the famous Ptolemies who ruled at Alexandria for nearly three centuries. Under the fostering care of some of these kings, who understood them better and treated them more wisely than the rival dynasty of Syrian Seleucids, the Jews grew and multiplied in prosperity, as they had multiplied in adversity in the old days of their Egyptian bondage. Before the dawn of the Christian era they had increased to a million, and not only occupied two of the five quarters of Alexandria as their exclusive Ghetto, but were also in possession of the best localities for business in the rest of the city. Their synagogue—the famous Diapleuston, with its seventy gilded chairs, and its size so vast that the signal for the "Amens" of the congregation had to be given by a flag—was the grandest in

[1] It is an interesting fact—a link between the farther and nearer epochs of antiquity—that Jaddua, B.C. 333, is the latest person (chronologically) who is mentioned in the Old Testament. Nehem. xi. 22; Jos. *Antt.* xi. 8, § 5.

the world.[1] The management of the harbour-shipping, and of the all-important export of corn, on which Rome depended for its daily bread, was mainly in their hands.[2] Their Sanhedrin was almost as venerable as that of Jerusalem. Their Alabarch was one of the principal persons in the city, and occupied a position of splendid dignity. The Temple of Onias at Leontopolis, while it did not alienate their affections from the Temple at Jerusalem, was a continual source of pride and gratification.[3] So great was the skill of the Alexandrian handicraftsmen that, if any of the finest work was required for the adornment of the Temple at Jerusalem, the Rabbis sent for workmen to Alexandria, as Solomon had done to the Phœnicians in days of old.[4] The privileges of the Jews had been secured to them under the Roman Empire by the generous edicts of Julius Cæsar and other emperors.[5]

The Jews had been able on more than one occasion to render valuable assistance to the Ptolemies, and especially to Ptolemy Philometor in his struggles against his brother Physkon. It was natural that the Egypto-Grecian kings should desire to know something of the vaunted lore of these remarkable subjects. The Greek Version of the Bible, so famous under the name of the Septuagint, was undertaken for the gratification of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who wished to

[1] See a description of the Diapleuston or Great Synagogue of Alexandria (of which it was said that "whoever had not seen it, had not seen the glory of Israel") in Succah, f. 51, *b*. There is the usual monstrous hyperbole—*e.g.*, that each of the 71 gilded chairs for the Sanhedrin was worth 21 myriad talents of gold! See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iv. 128.

[2] Philo, *c. Flac.* ii. 525 (ed. Mangey).

[3] It seems to have been built about A.D. 150.

[4] Yoma, 38, 1; Grätz, iii. 28.

[5] Jos. *Antt.* xiv. 10, §§ 1—10.

have a specimen of the Bible in the great library;[1] or, perhaps, as a result of the amicable relations between Ptolemy Philometor and the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus. The House of Lagos must have some of the credit for its production. Whatever may have been the history of this version—which is much obscured by the fictions of Aristeas as to its miraculous origin—the effects which it produced were deep and lasting. The Septuagint was, as the modern Jewish historian quaintly observes, "the first Apostle of the Gentiles." For the first time the heathen of every land were enabled to read and judge for themselves of all that "Moses delivered in his *mystic* volume."[2] The translators of the Greek Bible, whose names are for the most part unknown, rendered two immense, but unconscious, services to the Christianity which was soon to shine upon the world. They disseminated the monotheistic conviction, with the historic revelation on which it was based; and they created the peculiar dialect in which the New Testament was written. The task of the Apostles and Evangelists would have been far more difficult than it was, if they had not found ready to their hands a dialect which was even more flexible than the pure Greek of the Classics, and a religious phraseology for technical conceptions which had already begun to be widely understood.

The appearance of the Septuagint Version affected the Jews in very different ways. To the Alexandrian

[1] It is said that his attention was called to the subject by the eminent librarian, Demetrius Phalereus.

[2] Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 102. The epithet "*arcano*" seems to be due to the talk of allegorists, who denied that the literal sense was the real sense.

Jews, and generally to the Jews of the Dispersion, it furnished an occasion for unmitigated joy. They could now point with pride to the writings of Moses and the Prophets in proof that they too were in possession of a priceless literature. They could show the Greeks that there were Hebrew writers even greater than Pythagoras and Plato, who were the boast of Heathendom. The tenets of their religion became better known, and therefore more respected, wherever Greek was understood. Though Hebrew was now a dead language, and the Jews of Europe and Asia had for the most part forgotten their native Aramaic, they were kept faithful to the laws and institutions of their fathers. Thanks to the labours of "the Seventy," Moses was read in the synagogues every Sabbath day, and interpreted into a tongue understanded of the people.[1] We cannot, therefore, wonder that the Alexandrian Jews kept the day of the publication of the Septuagint as an annual feast-day, on which they visited with every sign of rejoicing the cells on the island of the Pharos in which tradition said that the version had been finished by supernatural aid.

Far different were the views of the stern old Hebraisers—the Hebrews of Hebrews—who taught in the schools of Palestine and Jerusalem. Rejecting the fiction of Aristeas, that the interpreters had been sent to Ptolemy Philadelphus from Jerusalem by the express sanction of the high-priest Eleazar, and scornfully

[1] In the *Life of St. Paul*, i. 369, I have mentioned the interesting fact that from the *Midrash*, or expository sermon delivered by the Apostle, we are enabled to tell with certainty what *Parashah* and *Haphtarah*, or First and Second Lessons, had been read from the LXX. in the Synagogue of Antioch, in Pisidia, on a certain Sabbath more than eighteen centuries ago.

denying that God had shown His approval by granting inspiration to the Translators, they regarded the rendering of their sacred tenets into a profane language as an irreparable misfortune. It had long been forbidden to write the words of the Torah on the skins of unclean animals; surely, they argued, it was a far greater profanation to express them in the accents of a pagan dialect. Was it even *possible* so to express them? Was it possible to place them in the crucible of an unhallowed language and not to evaporate some of their subtlest elements of truth? How could the God of Shem speak in the unblessed accents of Japhet? Was it not certain that, apart from the impossibility of making one tongue express the exact sentiments of another, there would be large room for unfaithful concessions to Greek and heathen prejudices on the part of the Translators? As a counter-manifesto to the exultation of the Alexandrian Jews,[1] they kept the day of the publication of the Greek Bible as a Fast, and a day of evil omen as deadly as that on which Israel had danced around the golden calf.[2]

And from their point of view the Rabbis of Jerusalem were more than half right. They had good grounds for being suspicious of what they called the "wisdom of the Ionians."[3] The publication of the Bible in Greek *did* tend to alter the conceptions of the Jews; to widen their tribalism; to prepare the way for Christianity; to throw down the middle wall of partition between them

[1] Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 140.

[2] See Frankel, *Vorstudien*, i. 61. In later times Justin Martyr complained that the Jews had falsified the Septuagint by cutting out passages which told in favour of the Christians, such as "Tell it out among the heathen, the Lord reigned *from the tree*" (ἀπὸ ξύλου), Ps. xcvi. 10. See Just. Mart. *Dial.* pp. 169, 170. Tert. *Adv. Marc.* iii. 19. Aug. *Enarratt. in Ps.* p. 714. But the words were probably a Christian gloss.

[3] "*Chokmath Javanith.*" See Derenbourg, *Palest.* p. 361.

and other nations; to show the absurdity of many of the legends, precedents, and inferential systems which they had based on the isolation of their favourite "texts." But, further than this, there can be little doubt that Judaism, when denuded of the *ism* wherein resided its intense exclusiveness, lost also much of its distinctive character. When the Jews began to recognise that they were not the monopolists of truth, they developed a tendency to underrate the preciousness of the truth which was their special heritage. It was by no means easy to fulfil the aspiration of the learned Rabbi Jochanan Ben Napuchah, who had desired to unite the pallium of Japhet with the tallîth of Shem.[1] When in the troubles which burst upon the Alexandrian Jews in the Proconsulship of Flaccus many of them purchased exemption from torture and massacre by apostasy, the religious conservatives of Palestine were strengthened in their conviction that the Jews could never study without peril the literature of the Gentiles. When an old Rabbi was asked at what hour Grecian literature might be studied, he replied that it could only be studied at an hour which belonged neither to the day nor to the night; for God's Law, and that only, ought to be man's meditation both day and night.[2]

Even the Seventy had shown that they either did not sufficiently understand the duty of absolute faithfulness in translators, or that in some instances their sense of the literal meaning of the Sacred Text had been biassed by the spirit of the age in which they moved.

[1] See *Life of Christ*, ii. 461; *Life of St. Paul*, i. 37. (Midrash Rabbah on Gen. xxxvi. &c.)

[2] Rabbi Ishmael, arguing from Jos. i. 8. Menachoth, f. 99, 2 (Derenbourg, *Palest.* 361).

Certain it is that they had left traceable indications of their private opinions, and of the tone of thought by which they were surrounded.

In some particulars their variations from the original had been comparatively harmless. If in reading the lists of clean and unclean animals the reader came upon the Greek word *dasupous*, or "rough-footed," when he knew that the animal mentioned in the Hebrew was the hare (*arnebeth*), he soon remembered with a smile that, if the courtly translator had rendered the word literally by *Lagos*, the Ptolemies might have seen with disgust that the founder of their dynasty bore the name of an animal which the Jews regarded as unclean! Again, if he found the homely ass (*onos*), on which Moses and the sons of Jair rode, dignified into a prancing steed (*polos*), this might seem to him a simple way of avoiding the scorn which a Greek unfamiliar with the value attached to the ass in Eastern countries would have felt when he read of any eminent person bestriding an animal so humble and so despised.[1] He would have been further amused by finding Keren Happuk, the daughter of Job (Job xlii. 14), whose name means "horn of stibium," turned into "Amalthea's horn;" and by the substitution of Greek for Hebrew proverbs in 1 Kings xx. 11 and Prov. xxiii. 27.[2] Again, the Seventy, in not a few instances, had introduced or implied the legends (Hagadoth) and precedents for inferential rules (Halachoth) which were not only sanctioned in the Rabbinic schools of Jerusalem, but which it was their main occupation to discover and to

[1] The LXX. were fond of euphemisms, as in their rendering of Gen. xlix. 10; Deut. xxiii. 14; Nah. iii. 5; Is. iii. 17; Job xxxi. 10. They show a little national vanity in small matters in Ex. ii. 1; iv. 6; vi. 12, 15; 1 Sam. xv. 12.

[2] Frankel, *Vorstud.* i. 203.

record. Thus in Deut. xxxii. 8 they had, "He set bounds to the people *according to the number of the Angels* of God;" in Josh. xxiv. 30 they insert that the flint knives used for circumcision in the wilderness had been buried in Joshua's grave; in Ex. xiii. 18 they rendered "harnessed" by "*five abreast*;" in Gen. iv. 4. they added that God "*kindled by fire*" the sacrifice of Abel; in Josh. xiii. 22 they follow the legend which made Balaam, like Simon Magus, fly in the air, until he was dashed down (ἐν ῥοπῇ) by Phinehas; in 1 Sam. xx. 30 they imply that Jonathan's mother was one of the maidens seized at Shiloh; in Num. xxxii. 12 they introduce the belief that Caleb was of Gentile origin.

These were pardonable eccentricities. But there was one important matter of dogma in which the Seventy had shown that they were the children of their own epoch and had deeply imbibed the opinions of the Greek philosophers. The Supreme Being of the Greek philosophers had been a Being infinitely exalted above human imperfections, and therefore a Being absolutely unlimited by human peculiarities. This view of "the Divine" had impressed itself on the philosophising Hellenists of Alexandria. They disliked the simple "*anthropomorphism*" of the earlier Sacred books, and did not wish to represent the God of Israel to the Gentiles as one who was pictured with a body, or who appeared in human form to the eyes of men. Still less was it consonant with Alexandrian prejudice to give literal renderings of those expressions which spoke of God by what is called "*anthropopathy*"—that is, as subject to wrath, repentance, or other human emotions. Yet the "anthropomorphism" and "anthropopathy" of the early Scriptural books could only be modi-

fied by imperfect or unfaithful renderings;—and of these the translators did not hesitate to be guilty.[1] In Gen. vi. 6 the expression "it repented the Lord," and similar phrases elsewhere, quietly disappear from the Greek Version. In Ex. xxiv. 10 the Elders of Israel are not allowed to see "God," but only "*the place where God stood.*"[2] The falsification of the following words is still more startling. Instead of "Upon the nobles . . . . He laid not His hand; also they saw God," we have the daring change "*Of the elders of Israel not even one perished* (diephonesen), *and they were seen in the place of God.*" Well might the Talmudist[3] charge the Seventy with intentional perversion of the text in this place. In Ex. iv. 16, "Thou shalt be to him for God (לאלהים)" becomes "*Thou shalt be to him the things that relate to God* (τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν)." In Num. xii. 8 the Epiphany to Moses is softened into a vision of the *Shechinah*, or glory. In Num. xiv. 14 it is not Jehovah, but the *Shechinah* which is seen face to face. In Job xxix. 25, in Ps. xlii. 3, and in many other places the direct expression "Jehovah" is softened into phrases of which the intention always is to place as many intermediates as possible between the Supreme and man. In Job xix. 26, 27, for "Yet in my flesh I shall see God, Whom I shall see for myself and my eyes shall behold, and not another," we have, "*For these things happened to me from the Lord, which I understand for myself, which my eye has seen, and not another.*" In Job xxxv. 14 "Although thou sayest thou

[1] See their versions of Ex. iii. 1; iv. 24; xvii. 16; xxv. 8. They are specially audacious in Ex. xix. 3.

[2] Ex. xxiv. 9—11. Καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἱστήκει ὁ Θεὸς.

[3] Megillah, f. 9, a.

shalt not see Him, yet judgment is before Him, trust thou in Him," becomes "*For the Almighty sees those who do wickedness, and shall save me; be judged before Him.*" In Ps. xvii. 15 the Seventy give us, "*I shall be seen before Him in righteousness, I shall be satisfied in His glory being seen.*" In Hezekiah's prayer (Is. xxxviii. 11) "I shall not see the Lord, the Lord in the land of the living" is turned into "*I shall not see the salvation of God in the land of the living, I shall not see the salvation of Israel on the earth.*"[1] In Is. ix. 6, "the mighty God" becomes "*an Angel of great counsel.*"

2. This and other tendencies find their illustration in the writings of the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus and in the *Wisdom of Solomon.*[2] Aristobulus, a man of priestly descent, is said to have been the first Jew who studied Greek philosophy, and he was an avowed Peripatetic. Living in the court of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 160), he stood in close terms of intimacy with the royal house, and presented the Pentateuch to the King, with a commentary and prolegomena. A fragment of this work, which is sometimes called a *Syngramma* and sometimes *Propephonemena,* is preserved for us by the indefatigable labours of Eusebius,[3] and in this fragment Aristobulus expressly warns the King against a literal understanding of anthropomorphic expressions. If God is spoken of as having hands, arms, feet, and so on, those—he says—must be simply looked upon as pictorial phrases. Where

[1] If there is no change in such passages as Amos ix. 1, etc., it is because these are understood as visions only. For a full treatment of the subject see Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta.*

[2] The avoidance of "*anthropomorphism*" and "*anthropopathy*" in the Targums is no less marked. Dr. Deutsch has supplied many instances in his *Literary Remains*, pp. 348—356.

[3] Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 10; xiii. 12.

it is said that "God *stands*," the reference is to the fixed order of the universe. The *speech* of God is only to be understood of ultimate causation, for "God spake and it was done." This philosopher appears to have translated the Book of Exodus in the Septuagint Version.

3. The author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* availed himself of the personification of "Wisdom" in the Book of Proverbs as the intermediate agency between God and man which the Alexandrian theosophy required. In this book "Wisdom" plays the part which is assigned to the Logos in the writings of Philo. The dualism—the existence of matter as the source of evil apart from God—of which there is a trace in the avoidance of the term "Creator" by Aristobulus, finds a distinct expression in the *Wisdom of Solomon* when the writer says that God's Almighty hand made the world out of matter without form.[1] In the opinion of the Alexandrians the world was not created out of nothing, but out of the formless chaos, the *Thohú va-bohú* of the second verse of the Book of Genesis. We see, too, in the Book of Wisdom the dislike of the body—that view of it as the fetter and prison rather than the home and temple of the soul—which was afterwards so strongly felt by the Neo-platonists that the philosopher Plotinus is said "to have blushed that he had a body." "The corruptible body," says this eloquent writer, "presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things."[2]

4. The epoch of the Septuagint was characterised by an outburst of Jewish literature of a semi-ethnic character. A poet named Ezekiel dramatised the

[1] Wisd. xi. 17. [2] Wisd. ix. 15.

Exodus; another named Philo wrote an epic on Jerusalem; a third—Theodotus—chose his theme from the story of Dinah and Shechem. Demetrius and Eupolemos wrote history; and the *Story of Susanna* is one of several specimens of Jewish romance. But the name of all the other Alexandrian writers is eclipsed by that of the great Philo, who reproduced Jewish theology for the benefit of Greek and Hellenist philosophers, just as Josephus reproduced Jewish history for the benefit of cultivated Romans. But there is this difference between Philo and Josephus. The astute historian well knew what he was about. He falsifies and colours, and omits and modifies with consummate skill and coolness whenever it suits him, and feels as little scruple in assimilating the Pharisees to the Stoics as he feels in describing the Angel who appeared to the mother of Samson as a handsome youth who kindled the jealousy of Manoah. Philo, on the other hand, wrote with far greater unconsciousness. Unable to read Hebrew [1]—knowing the Sacred books chiefly, if not exclusively, in the Greek Version—having breathed from childhood the atmosphere of Alexandrian speculation—he no doubt considered that he had really grasped the key to the inner meaning of the Scriptures, and that his method of exegesis was the only way to rescue them from philosophic contempt. But it is a great mistake to suppose that he *invented* the philosophic system which is generally known by his name. The main beliefs of that system were—that matter is impure; that God cannot appear under material form, and is therefore invisible; that He chose the Jewish people to receive

[1] This is clear from his mistakes in explaining simple Hebrew names. See Frankel, *Vorstudien*, ii. 28—41.

His revelations; that those revelations can only be interpreted by allegoric methods; that He deals with men solely through the Logos or Word, and the *logoi* or Divine forces; that the body is the source of evil; that the soul is pre-existent; that to gain God's mercy the flesh must be slain, and we must attain to the virtues of resignation, unworldliness, simplicity, faith, hope, and love. But none of these views was absolutely original. He does not announce them as such. He writes as though he were addressing readers who would at once recognise the truth of what he says. His thoughts, apart from many new illustrations, are not peculiar to him, but are found throughout the whole circle of Alexandrian literature.[1] The grounds for this statement will be found in the sketch of the life and writings of Philo, which occupies the following chapter.

[1] To prove this is the object of the second volume of Gfrörer's learned book on Philo, to which I have been much indebted. The author has pointed out that there are in Josephus many traces of similar views.

CHAPTER XIII.

PHILO, AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS.

Σχέδον γὰρ τὰ πάντα ἢ τὰ πλεῖστα τῆς νομοθεσίας ἀλληγορεῖται.
PHILO, *De Josepho.*

AMONG the Jews of Alexandria the family of the Alabarch Alexander had risen to a pre-eminent position. They were of priestly origin, and of wealth so immense that on one occasion Alexander, out of regard to Queen Cypros, found no difficulty in lending to Agrippa I. the great sum of 200,000 drachmæ.[1] At Jerusalem the family was favourably known from the splendid generosity with which the Alabarch had enriched nine gates of the Temple with silver and gold.[2] At Rome they were so much honoured for their integrity that Antonia, the mother of Claudius, made Alexander her steward, and Claudius showed him marked favour. His son, Tiberius Alexander, at the terrible price of apostasy from his religion, rose so high in the Roman service as to be appointed Procurator of Palestine, and, afterwards, Præfect of Alexandria. Of the other two sons, one married Berenice, and died early, the other succeeded his father in the office of Alabarch.[3]

Philo was the brother of this Jewish Crœsus,[4] and therefore the uncle of the three Alexandrian Jews who

[1] Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 6, § 3.
[2] *Id., B. J.* v. 5, § 3.
[3] Jos. *Antt.* xix. 5, § 1; xx. 5, § 2.
[4] *Ibid.* xviii. 8, § 1; Gfrörer, *Philo*, i. 1—7.

played so considerable a part in the history of their day. He seems to have passed his life in unbroken prosperity, troubled only by that "inexorable weariness" which is experienced by most men at some period of their lives. He complains somewhat querulously of burdens which might have been lightly borne by those who had been called upon to face severer troubles.[1] He was married, and his wife had so profound an admiration for him that, when asked why she wore no jewels, she answered, in the spirit of the mother of the Gracchi, that "her husband's virtue was her sufficient jewellery."[2] In Philo's single visit to Jerusalem, which fell during the lifetime of Jesus, his priestly birth secured him the privilege of offering sacrifices in the Temple.[3] In the troubles which arose in Alexandria from the brutality of the Greek and Egyptian mob and the ill-humour of the Præfect Flaccus, he was chosen one of the ambassadors to the Emperor Gaius, and was an eye-witness of the strange scenes of which he has left so vivid a picture in his description of the insane and odious tyrant.[4] He employed his peaceful days in acquiring the knowledge, superficial in character, but encyclopædic in range, which was the fashion of his time; and he threw himself with enthusiasm into the pious task of allegorising Scripture in such a way as to make it speak the language of Greek philosophy, and especially of "the holy Plato" and "the holy community of the Pytha-

[1] *De Legg. Spec.* ii., *ad init.* *στένων δ' ὅμως ἀντέχω.* (Mangey, ii. 299.) My references to Philo will be made to the folio edition of Mangey (1742), but I generally add the *section* also.

[2] *Fragm.* (Mang. ii. 673.)

[3] See Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 12; Jer. *Cat. Script.* Some think that Alexander in Acts iv. 6 was his brother.

[4] In his *Legatio ad Gaium*, the most popular of his writings.

goreans."[1] He was one of those who, under God's Providence, helped to pave the way for Christianity; but that he was not himself a Christian, as early legends assert, is shown by the absence from his writings of every distinctively Christian truth. Judaism sufficed him. In one eloquent passage he argues for the Divine Mission of Moses from the immutability of his legislation amid the numberless vicissitudes of Jewish life, while the works of all other lawgivers had been incessantly modified, abrogated, and swept away.[2]

All the numerous works of Philo may be grouped round four treatises; namely, those on the Creation of the world; on Abraham; on Joseph; and on the Life of Moses.[3]

I. The first of these—the book on the Creation—and the tracts which touch upon cognate subjects—are an endeavour to bring the Mosaic cosmogony into harmony with the views of Plato in his *Timæus*.[4] Philo keeps in sight two elements of creation:—on the one hand a formless chaos; on the other a Being better than all goodness, holier than all holiness, more beautiful than all beauty, of Whom man may know indeed that He *is*, but hardly *what* He is.[5] But how was it possible

[1] *De Provid.* ii. 42: "*Quod omnis prob. liber,*" *ad init.* Τὸν Πυθαγορείων ἱερώτατον θίασον. [2] *De Vita Mosis*, ii. § 3 (Mangey, ii. 136).

[3] See Zeller, iii. 2,603; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgesch. Die Zeit d. Apost.* 152. Gfrörer divides his writings into four general classes:—(1) Philosophic (*De mundi incorruptibilitate; Quod omnis probus liber; De vita contemplativa*); (2) Historical (*De mundi opificio; De vita Mosis; De Decalogo; De Monarchiâ; De Circumcisione; De legibus specialibus; De praemiis et poenis. &c.*); (3) Allegorising (*Liber Legis allegoriarum; De somniis, &c.*); (4) Political (*Legatio ad Gaium; Contra Flaccum*); Philo. i. 7—37.

[4] Hence the oft-quoted proverb, "Either Philo platonises, or Plato philonises." (Suidas, &c.)

[5] St. John, on the other hand, says (i. 3), "Without Him was not even one thing made that hath been made."

to bridge over the vast abyss between the two? How, in the words of Plato, could the mortal be woven into the immortal? Philo meets the difficulty partly by the conception of the LOGOS, "the Word" by Whom God created all things; and partly by the yet lower agencies of "intermediate words"—spiritual entities—angels of all kinds, "thrones, dominations, virtues, princedoms, powers"—who had their share in the work of creation, and by whose existence Philo accounts for the plural "Let us make man." The visible world was not created at once, but there existed in the Divine understanding an eternal determination not to leave Chaos in its formlessness. This determination constituted a spiritual world, which was the archetype and exemplar of the visible. It was the Perfect Idea, of which material existences are the transient and imperfect copy.

II. In the treatises on Abraham and on Joseph, Philo gives the reins to his imagination. The simple narratives of Scripture become, as narratives, almost valueless. They lose their historical beauty and human interest. They become elaborate allegories, through which move a crowd of vapid abstractions. Abraham leaving his country and his kindred and his father's house, is lowered into a sort of typical Stoic departing from the Chaldæa of the sensual understanding to seek the land of pure reason, and turning his back upon desire, and fear, and ambition. He is, in fact, not an Oriental Emîr called to inaugurate the era of the chosen people, but a symbol of the soul seeking God. The Chaldees worshipped stars, and therefore the call to Haran was an indication that he was to look, not at the universe, but at himself. Haran means "Holes," and is a symbol of the five

senses. Abraham's further wanderings mean that he attains to the knowledge of God. Abram means, according to Philo, "aspiring father," with an allusion to his star-worship, but Abraham means "father of sound." Sound is like speech, but "father of sound" is like spirit which utters sound.[1] Similarly he says that Sarai means "my rule," and Sarra (=Sarah) "princess;" and that the first name allegorically signifies particular virtue, which is transient; and the second, generic virtue, which is eternal and incorruptible.[2] Thus the grand old patriarch becomes a cold cypher, indicative of mental earnestness; Sarah, the beautiful and passionate Eastern woman, fades into an unsatisfactory symbol for an abstraction. The laughter from which the name of Isaac was derived, becomes the joy of the philosopher who has conquered every evil impulse, and entered into the rest of the Eternally Real. And whereas Sarah is Virtue and abstract Wisdom, Hagar represents only the general sciences of grammar, music, geometry, dialectics, and rhetoric! If Jacob comes to a certain place when the sun sets, the statement in the Philonian system is explained by the remarks that the sun is the perceptive faculty, the place is the Divine Word, and Jacob is wisdom attained by training. Hence the only value which that pathetic and deeply instructive story possesses for Philo is the somewhat dreary platitude that man can only grasp the Divine when his natural understanding has set like the sun.[3]

III. In the Life of Moses, Philo is anxious to

[1] Πατὴρ ἔκλεκτος ἤχου. *De Cherubim*, i. § 2 (Mang. i. 139).

[2] *De nom. mutat.* § 8, etc. (Mang. i. 591, etc.).

[3] "*Quod a Deo mittantur somnia*," § xxii *sq.* (Mang. i. 638, *sq.*; Grätz, iii. 295).

prove the absurd hypothesis that the Gentiles have learnt their wisdom and philosophy from the Jews, and that Moses was practically the master of Hesiod and Heraclitus, of Plato and Zeno.[1] Here, as everywhere, Philo cares almost nothing for the letter of the Law. He is indeed a faithful Jew, and thinks that the Law should be rigidly observed. Just as we cherish the body as the dwelling-place of the soul, so (he says) ought we to keep the letter of the Law, although its real meaning lies exclusively in the esoteric senses which can be tortured out of it.[2] Circumcision, and the Sabbath, and all the other Mosaic institutions, are but allegories.[3] Even as to the plainest details of jurisprudence, which, in their homely realism, seemed too coarse to form any part of a Divine revelation—such, for instance, as that which punished the immodest interference of women in quarrels—an explanation was forthcoming. The passage is made to mean that every soul has male and female elements, of which the male elements reach forth to the heavenly and the female to the earthly, and that our natural tendency towards the transitory must be flung off.[4] So sincere was Philo in his belief that truth could only be found in these strange paths of exegesis, that he thanked God for having allowed him to be the interpreter who rendered clear the meaning of that which to the mass of men had hitherto been unintelligible.[5] He even tells us that he occasionally fell into ecstasies, in which he was prophetically made

[1] *Quis rer. div. haeres* (i. 503, and other passages). See Grätz, iii. 295.

[2] *De Cherubim, ad init.* and *passim.*

[3] *Leg. allegg., ad init.* (Mang. i. 43); *De Josepho,* § 6 (Mang. ii. 46).

[4] *De spec. legg.* (ii. 329); *De circumc.* (ii. 211); Grätz, iii. 297.

[5] *De spec. legg.* (ii. 300).

aware of profound meanings, which otherwise would have escaped him.[1] Yet, though he thus allegorises everything, his views wholly differ from those of the Epistle of Barnabas. Anything like disrespect for the *letter* of the Law struck him as impious. He delights to point out instances of retribution which fell on the enemies of Israel. He tells of an Alexandrian who, having made himself merry on "the splendid present which the Lord of the world had made to the patriarch Abraham and his wife Sarah, by presenting the one (in Greek) with the letter *alpha* and the other with the letter *rho*," became afterwards mad, as a punishment inflicted on him by Heaven.[2]

The Philonian method is of all styles of exegesis the most arbitrary. But Philo unquestionably did not invent it. Both among Rabbis and Alexandrians it was already in the air. It sprang from the spirit of the times. It was the inevitable result of two beliefs, which would otherwise have come into dangerous collision—the belief in Biblical inspiration, and the belief in Greek philosophy. Alexandrian Jews had to reconcile the letter of the Bible with convictions which could only be deduced from it by allegorising processes. When they had come to believe in Platonic idealism and Pythagorean mysteries—to look on matter as impure, to regard the Divine Being as incognisable, to contemn the body as the source of all evil—they saw no way out of their difficulties except by inventing a Logos as High-priest of the world, and subordinating to him all kinds

[1] *De Cherubim*, § 10 (i. 143): "I once also heard something of still deeper significance from my soul, which is frequently accustomed to be filled with inspiration (θεοληπτεῖσθαι), and to exercise divination (μαντεύεσθαι) concerning things which it does not know."

[2] *De nomin. mutat.* § 8 (Mang. i. 587).

of powers and spirits, until they had taken the golden reins of external nature out of the hands of God, and transferred them to the charge of intermediate beings.[1]

It may help the reader to understand the method in virtue of which this Judaic philosophy claimed its sole right to exist, if I furnish one or two more specimens of the allegorising inferences which enabled the Alexandrians to make Moses express the thoughts of Plato, and to turn "a religious philosophy" into something which they took for "a philosophic religion." But for these I must refer to the Excursus on "Specimens of Philonian Allegory" at the end of the book.

The doctrine most closely identified with the name of Philo is that of the Logos; and it is sometimes asserted that St. John, and, to a certain extent, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews—who, however, seems to avoid the use of the actual word—borrowed it from him. It is easy to show that this is far from being an accurate statement of the case.

The word *Logos* has two meanings, Reason and Speech. Philo uses it sometimes in one and sometimes in the other of these senses, but predominantly in the former. When he wishes to distinguish between them, he calls Speech "uttered Reason" (*logos prophorikos*), and Reason "immanent Speech" (*logos endiathetos*). The Reason, he says, is like a fountain, and the utterance flows from it. The seat of the reason is the ruling and spiritual sphere of human nature; the seat of speech is in the vocal organs.[2] Hence "the Divine Logos" is the manifestation of God; and "the Sacred logos" is used for the Scriptures; and the

[1] Gfrörer, *Philo*, i. 73.
[2] *De Vit. Mosis*, iii. § 13 (Mang. ii. 154).

"true logos" is the rule of life, namely, to live in accordance with the highest nature. He uses the plural, "the divine *logoi*," for "the powers of nature." It requires but one step in advance to personify these *logoi* and identify them with angels. On the other hand, angels are sometimes volatilised into ideas. Hence, in the weakest of its aspects, the philosophy of Philo might be represented by those who dislike it as one of the systems in which "naught is everything, and everything is naught."[1]

But, besides all this, the Logos Himself is again and again directly personified.

(*a*.) He is above all the High Priest. Those who fled to a city of refuge could only return when the High-priest died: which means that as long as the Logos abides in the soul no accidental fault ever can enter into it; but if the Logos dies, *i.e.*, is separated from the soul, a return of the soul to Him is possible even after willing sins. Let us then pray that the stainless High-priest may live in the soul as our judge and convincer.[2]

(*β*.) In another passage he compares this high-priestly Logos to a cup-bearer. Commenting on Gen. xl., he says grapes and vineyards sometimes symbolise the joyous absorption of the soul in God, sometimes drunkenness and wickedness. The cup-bearer of Pharaoh is he who feeds his godless master with sensuality; for Pharaoh, who says "I know not God,"[3]

[1] Additional illustrations of Philo's views about the Logos will be found in Excursus VII.

[2] *De Profugis* (Mang. i. 563). The allegory is more than usually clumsy.

[3] Philo here seems to confuse the Pharaoh of Joseph with the Pharaoh of Moses (Ex. v. 2).

as a type of the godless mind. But the cup-bearer of God is the Sacrificer, the true High Priest, Who receives and distributes the eternal gifts of grace, and pours out the holy vials full of pure wine—that is, Himself.[1] And as the High-priest Aaron was father of Eleazar and Ithamar, so the Logos High Priest is Father of the heavenly *logoi* and powers.

(γ.) In other passages the Logos is the image of God, the shadow of God, the instrument of all creation, the likeness of God, Who is the archetype of all other things. He is also spoken of as the eldest and the firstborn Son of God;[2] and as an Archangel, and the eldest Archangel, who stands as an intermediate between the Creator and the created. Again, he is the angel that appeared to Hagar; the angel that punished Sodom; the God Who appeared to Jacob at Bethel, and wrestled with him at Peniel; the angel that appeared to Moses in the bush; the pillar of fire which led the Israelites out of Egypt; the angel which appeared to Balaam; the leader of Israel through the wilderness. Melchizedek is a symbol of Him,[3] and so are Noah, and Bezaleel, and Aaron, and Moses.

(δ.) By this time the reader will have seen how vague is Philo's conception; how it floats in the air; how the outlines of it are perpetually confused together or melt away. He will see that whether any of the New Testament writers were familiar with Philo, or only with the circle of conceptions in which he moved, the amount to which they are indebted to those conceptions is as nothing compared to the new and

[1] *De somniis*, ii. (Mang. i. 685 *sq.*).
[2] *De ling. confus.* §§ xi., xxviii. (Mang. i. 413, 419).
[3] *Leg. allegg.* iii. § 25 (Mang. i. 102).

immortal life which they breathe into them. In Philo they are, and they would ever have remained, dead philosophic generalisations, founded on loose allegoric methods, and abounding in irreconcilable contradictions. In the New Testament they breathe and stand on their feet as clear, living, and redemptive truths. Philo's misty and ever-changing Logos is an intellectual possession for Judaising philosophers, but is almost inconceivably removed from the Divine Redeemer, the Saviour of all the world. Between the doctrine and method of Philo and that of the Apostles the difference is as wide as that between the living and the dead.

The four words of St. John, "*The Word became flesh,*" created an epoch. They tell us more, and are of infinitely more value to us than all the pages and volumes on the subject which Philo and his contemporaries ever wrote. They summarise and concentrate the inmost meaning of the Old Testament revelation and of post-canonical thoughts.[1] They are as a flash of the sword of that Word which cleaves even to the dividing asunder of sword and spirit; a flash which dispels a thousand distorting mists, a sword to cleave the knot of a thousand difficulties, which the Alexandrian philosophy vainly endeavoured to cleave or to unloose.

[1] Dr. Westcott—who thinks that St. John borrowed the *expression* (not, of course, the *doctrine*) from the Palestinian *Memra* (which always means "word" only), not the Alexandrian *Logos* (which predominantly means Intelligence)—says that St. John's evangelic message is the complete fulfilment of three distinct lines of preparatory revelation—namely, (i.) "the Angel of the Presence" (Gen. xxxii. 24, &c.), (ii.) the "Word," (Gen. i. 1, &c), and (iii.) "Wisdom" (Prov. viii. 22, &c.).

CHAPTER XIV.

PHILONISM, ALLEGORICAL EXEGESIS, AND THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA.

"All things are double one against another."—Ecclus. xlii. 24.

"Two worlds are ours; 'tis only sin
Forbids us to descry
The mystic heaven and earth within,
Plain as the sea and sky."—KEBLE.

We have already seen that St. Paul was acquainted with some of the writings of Philo, or, at any rate, with the ideas which filled the Alexandrian literature of that epoch, and of which Philo was an exponent.[1] We shall learn, farther on, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was deeply imbued not only with the phraseology of the great Alexandrian, but also with the general principles of his theology.[2] But we shall see also how entirely free he is from the defects and weakness, the unreality and the affectations of the Philonian philosophy. There is perhaps no more striking proof of the spiritual gifts of the Sacred writers than the fact that even when they show to the most marked degree the influence of the various forms of lifelong training to which they had been subjected, they

[1] See *Life of St. Paul*, i. 642, 643.

[2] It was the observation of this influence that led to the Church legends that Philo for a time embraced Christianity (Photius, *Cod.* cv.), in consequence of having met St. Peter at Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 17).

rise superior to the errors and limitations of the very systems to which they are indebted.

And yet this "Sapiential literature of Alexandria" —the literature which is represented by the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom and in the writings of Philo —had a great part to play in the development of Revelation. It worthily filled up the interspace between Malachi and the earliest Epistles of St. Paul. The Septuagint created the dialect and phraseology in which the Gospel was to be proclaimed, and the Alexandrian writers, not without heavenly guidance, helped to smooth the path which the early Christian thinkers were to tread. Alexandrianism was too vague, too receptive, too little conscious of the width and depth of the chasm which separates Sacred from Jewish literature; but in its successful endeavour to break down the exclusiveness of Judaism it prepared the way for Christianity as the universal revelation, in which there should be neither Jew nor Greek, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.

But, with all its merits, Philonism had obvious defects. The orthodox Rabbis showed their shrewdness when they looked on it with jealousy and suspicion. It was a system of syncretism, and it swarmed with contradictions. It attempted to weld together two dissimilar, if not antagonistic, elements—the letter of Scripture and the Platonic philosophy. The attempt was as unsatisfactory as that of the Schoolmen to form systems which combined Aristotle with the New Testament. Sometimes the philosophic conception was sacrificed to the letter; more frequently the letter was set aside to make room for the philosophy. The allegorical distortion of literal narratives—if it be taken for exegesis

is almost ludicrous. But the Judaisers saw clearly that the method might be so extended as to explain away the whole ceremonial law; and, in point of fact, it *was* so extended. The pride of fancied initiation made some of the Alexandrians despise Levitism just as some of the Gnostics advanced so far in their falsely-called knowledge as at last to despise even the moral law. It is a startling comment on the tendency of Philo's speculations when we find that his nephew was an avowed renegade.

But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was not the only Christian writer who had been influenced by the Philonian philosophy. Alexandria became from the earliest days of Christianity the home of a Christian school of thought.[1] The Alexandrian converts were confronted from the first by the same problems, and surrounded by the same influences as their Jewish predecessors. The fact that their teaching was carried on in the midst of Pagans and philosophers—men of wide training and cultivated intellect—rendered it indispensable for them to present Christianity in such a manner as should neither repel their opponents, nor give them an easy victory over ignorant assertions and futile anathemas. From this necessity arose the great catechetical School of Alexandria, which claimed as its founder the Evangelist St. Mark. Its earliest teacher of any fame was the venerable Pantænus, who is always spoken of by his successors with affection and respect. He was followed by St. Clemens of Alexandria, many of whose invaluable writings

[1] ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους, Euseb. *H. E.* v. 10.

are still preserved to us. Clemens was followed by the greatest of all the Fathers, the most Apostolic man since the days of the Apostles, the Father who in every branch of study rendered to the Church the deepest and widest services—the immortal Origen. Origen was succeeded by his pupils Heraclas and Dionysius, to whom succeeded Pierius, Theognostus, Peter Martyr, Arius, and Didymus. This brings us to the fourth century, after which the glory of the school completely died away.

It was the successful effort of these thinkers to prove to the Gentiles that Christianity in no wise shunned the light of reason, but was always ready to come forth into the noon-day, and to meet opponents with a culture equal to their own. They also aimed at checking the Gnostic vanity, which looked down with contempt on the faith of the ignorant, and prided itself on the possession of esoteric mysteries. These were high and worthy ends. But it was no less necessary to show to the zealots of a presumptuous religionism that if God has no need of human knowledge, He has still less need of human ignorance; that a chastened speculation and a Divine philosophy were not only permissible, but necessary in the field of Christian learning; that there was such a thing as an Ethnic as well as a Christian inspiration; and that so far from looking askance on the light which shone outside the Sacred Tabernacle, all Christians should learn to love and welcome it as being a ray from the same inexhaustible orb of glory.[1] The Christian scholars of Alexandria chose as the motto of their school the Greek version of Is. vii. 9, "*If ye believe not, ye shall never understand*"

[1] See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 264, etc.

The words, indeed, are not accurately translated, and are torn from their context. This, however, has been the fate of nine-tenths of the "texts" which have been distorted into the watchwords of party dogmatism; and a misapplication of Scripture is at least pardonable when it is applied to noble purposes, and not (as is so often the case) to burn incense to pride or add fuel to hatred. The saintly Catechists of Alexandria used their motto to imply a twofold truth—namely, that no one could understand the inmost meaning of Judaism who did not accept the Christian revelation; and that no one could advance to the mysteries of the Gospel who did not possess an unsophisticated faith in its initial principles.[1]

In the then stage of Scriptural knowledge the Alexandrian teachers would have found it difficult to defend many parts of the Old Testament without the use of allegory. It was only by allegory that Philo had been able to educe from the Pentateuch the secrets of Greek philosophy. His genius had deepened the conviction that the Scripture was a profound enigma, in which the simple narrative and the obvious moral were all but valueless. But this conviction was not the growth of a day. If the Alexandrian Fathers derived it in part from the influence of Philo,[2] Philo had himself derived it from predecessors who had invented that mystic exegesis which, in its turn, was developed into the system of the Kabbala.

Taking the word *Pardes*, or "Paradise," as their watchword of interpretation, the Kabbalists had declared

[1] See Bacon, *Nov. Organ.* i. 68, "ut non alius fere sit aditus ad regnum hominis quod fundatur in scientiis, quam ad regnum cœlorum, *in quod nisi sub personâ infantis intrare non datur.*"

[2] Philo is frequently quoted by Clemens and Origen, as also by Eusebius.

that every passage of Scripture was capable of a fourfold interpretation, indicated by the letters P R D S. These letters represented the words—

Peshat, or "explanation."
Remez, or "hint."
Darush, or "homily."
Sod, or "mystery."

In these ways the Rabbis said that the Law could be explained in forty-nine different manners.[1]

PANTÆNUS was the earliest Catechist who gave his adhesion to the allegoric method,[2] and we are told that he applied to the Church what is written of Paradise. CLEMENS vehemently condemns carnal interpretation (σαρκικῶς), and says that nothing should be deduced from Scripture but what is perfectly accordant with the Divine nature.[3] He held that *all* Scriptures, alike of the Old and New Testaments, demanded an allegoric, as well as a literal, interpretation, and he applied to them the passage in the Psalms, "I will open my mouth in parables."[4] He said that the literal sense sufficed for an elementary faith, but that allegory was required for more illustrious knowledge.[5] Thus he explains the furniture of the Tabernacle, and the story of Agar and Sarah, and many other passages in a way which might have delighted Philo. It was, however, ORIGEN who laid down the express rule that Scripture consisted of the visible and the invisible, as man consists of the body and the soul,

[1] See my paper on "Rabbinic Exegesis" in the *Expositor*, v. 362.

[2] Athenagoras, who, perhaps, preceded Pantænus, was not remarkable in any way as an exegete, and he accepted Scripture literally. He paid chief attention to the Prophets, and strangely neglected the New Testament.

[3] *Strom.* ii. 16.

[4] Ps. lxxviii. 2. Compare 1 Cor. ii. 6; *Strom.* v. 4; vi. 15.

[5] *Strom.* vi. 15.

and that all Scripture, in order to discover the inner soul and spirit, should be interpreted in a threefold sense—historic, moral, and mystic.[1] But he did not quite fling away the literal sense. In proof of its usefulness he appealed to the faith of simple Christians. Nor did he ever proceed to allegory till he had first ascertained, by all the critical aids in his power, the grammatical meaning of the passage on which he was commenting. DIONYSIUS, while still continuing the allegorical method, leaned with greater favour to moral interpretation. PIERIUS followed more closely the guidance of Origen. It was not till the close of the third century that allegory was gradually abandoned by PETER MARTYR, and still later by DIDYMUS, in consequence of the growing influence of the great School of Antioch.[2]

The system continued, however, to be used not only in the Eastern but even in the Western Church. St. Jerome said that to be content with the literal sense of Scripture was "to eat dust like the serpent." The writings of St. Hilary are full of allegorical fancies. He declared it *irreligious* to take literally the natural objects so exquisitely described in Psalm cxlvi. By the "fowls of the air" in Matt. vi. he understands the devils, and by the "cities" the angels. The "two sparrows" which "are sold for one farthing" are sinners whose souls being made to fly upwards sell themselves for trifles. More than one of the Fathers has explained the Mosaic distinction between clean and unclean animals by saying that those which divide the hoof

[1] *Hom. V., in Levit.* § 1; *De princip.* iv. 11.

[2] See Guerike, *De Scholâ Alex.*, and Vacherot, *Hist. Crit. de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*, i. 100—303.

represent those who believe in the Father and the Son, and those which chew the cud represent those who meditate on God's Law; whereas the unclean animals, which neither divide the hoof nor chew the cud, imply those who neither have faith in God nor study His Law. No modern writer can attach the smallest value to such inferences as these. But though the day has come when the allegorical method must be limited to rigid conditions—though it is now regarded as useless for purposes of proof, and only valuable by way of illustration—we must not forget that it once played an important part in the development of doctrine, and that even the Sacred writers have furnished splendid instances of the method in which it may be applied.[1]

[1] On modern allegorical systems, as exemplified in Swedenborg, see Möhler, *Symbolik*, p. 589 (ed. 1864).

CHAPTER XV.

AUTHORSHIP AND STYLE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

"De Deo homo dixit et quidem inspiratus a Deo, sed tamen homo .... non totum quod est dixit; sed quod potuit homo dixit."—AUG. *Tract. in Joh.* i. 1.

SUCH being, in outline, a history of the great School of Christian philosophy and Christian criticism in Alexandria, we may well be thankful that one of the Sacred Books—while it is the only book of the Canon which emanated from the School of St. Paul—bears the stamp of Alexandrian thought. It thus furnishes one more link of solid gold in the continuity which binds us to the Church of the Jewish Fathers. That is a truly Catholic philosophy which seeks to combine all that is precious and permanent in the wisdom of patriarchs and philosophers, of Hellenists and Hebraists. There ought to be a common sympathy among those who in all nations have loved the Lord, even when they knew Him not: among all who have—by His holy inspiration—thought worthy thoughts respecting the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

For all true wisdom is, in its essence, Divine wisdom. There is a light which lighteth every man who is born into the world. Even amid the moral aberrations of heathenism it was granted to some—granted, let us trust, to many—to keep that light

unquenched. I know not whether any are still so narrow as to refuse all recognition of inspiration outside the limits of Scripture—any who would still be shocked by the discovery that a Philo, with all his tedious allegorisings and cold abstractions, was yet an appointed minister in influencing the thoughts of an Apollos[1] and a St. John. But if there be any such, let them remember that "*Every* good gift and *every* perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with Whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning." A Socrates, a Plato, a Sakya Mouni—these, too, had reared their altars to "the unknown God;" these, too, were enabled to shed some light on the darkness of sin and sorrow, because they had kindled their torches at the Sun of Righteousness, and drawn some sparks of light from the unemptiable fountain of Divine wisdom.[2] If it be a fatal error to cut ourselves adrift from any age in the past history of Christianity—if we shall one day suffer for having disowned our brotherhood with the Church of the Middle Ages, or the Church of the Reformers—so is it also an error to dissever ourselves from *any* in the redeemed brotherhood of man who have taught truth, even if it has been mingled with

[1] It will be seen farther on that there are very strong reasons for believing that Apollos wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. I venture therefore to ask permission to use his name by anticipation, at least hypothetically, in order to avoid cumbrous periphrases.

[2] Wisd. vii. 25, 26: "For she (Wisdom) is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty; therefore can no defiled thing fall into her. For she is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of His goodness. And *being but one, she can do all things*, and remaining in herself she maketh all things new; and, *in all ages, entering into holy souls*, she maketh them friends of God and prophets."

error, or who have served God, even if it has not been with the service of the Sanctuary. Truth is truth, and it comes from God, whether the speaker be a Balaam or an Elijah, a Caiaphas or a St. John. In the multiplicity of parts and diversity of methods which have characterised the deliverance of the one great Revelation, even the heathen have borne their share. Verses quoted from the Greek poets are to be read on the Sacred page. Philo was deeply influenced by Plato, and Philo in his turn has left on Christian Apostles his own vivid impress. St. Paul did not think it necessary to apologise when he alluded to a homely Latin fable; the risen Lord of Glory did not disdain to address a Greek proverb to His erring saint.

In speaking thus of Ethnic inspiration, I am but reviving—as I have tried to do in other instances—a truth which was firmly held by the greatest thinkers of the Primitive Church, but which, since the days of St. Augustine, has been forgotten or concealed. The primitive doctrine of Inspiration—as held by Justin Martyr, and by the School of Alexandria, who freely appeal to the inspired testimony of "minds naturally Christian"—only resembles the popular doctrine in the use of similar terms, but not in the significance which the terms really bear. The Apologists of the second century, and the philosophic Greek Christians of the third, never hesitated to recognise the truth that the influences of the Spirit are as the wind which bloweth where it listeth, and that the poets and philosophers of the heathen are often the conscious and unconscious exponents of His inward voice. They held with the much injured and much caluminated Montanus, whom

Wesley regarded as the best man of his age, that the soul of man is like a lyre, and that it breaks forth into music when its strings are swept by "the plectrum of the Paraclete."

In these remarks it may be thought that I have begged the question by assuming that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by St. Paul. This, however, is not the case. Even in the recognised writings of the great Apostle there are traces of thoughts which emanated from Alexandria.[1] St. Paul, after his conversion, certainly belonged to that Hagadistic school of Jewish exegesis[2] without which there would hardly have been any room for Philo or for any Hellenist within the narrow limits of Jewish orthodoxy. Philo did something towards breaking down that bristling hedge of technicalities, in the construction of which so many of the Rabbis intensified their Pharisaism, and wasted their unprofitable toil. Paul had been in his earlier years a student, and perhaps remained a student to the last. There is, therefore, no improbability in the conjecture that he was acquainted with Philo's writings.[3] But even if St. Paul had found room in his

[1] Even Philo appeals to older writings (συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν). as did also the Therapeutae. (Tholuck, 79.)

[2] See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 639—642; and Delitzsch, *Commentar. Zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, xxvi., xxvii.

[3] The following passages of St. Paul show familiarity with the Alexandrian author of the *Wisdom of Solomon* :—

2 Cor. v. 1, "The *earthly* house of our *tabernacle*."	Wisd. ix. 15, "The earthly tabernacle."
Rom. i. 20, "The invisible things of Him . . . are clearly seen, being perceived by the things that are made."	Wisd. xiii. 1, "Who are ignorant of God, and could not out of the good things that are seen know Him that is."

large heart for such truths as God had revealed to his philosophic contemporary, not one of his Epistles is coloured with Alexandrian conceptions to anything like the same extent as the Epistle to the Hebrews. Comparative criticism has made it little short of certain that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by St. Paul. That science has made gigantic strides since the days of the Fathers. Even if the conclusion had been arrived at in spite of patristic authority, it is established on grounds too sure to be shaken. But in point of fact it is in strict accordance with the tenor of ancient evidence. The continued assertion of the Pauline authorship shows but too plainly to what an extent the manliness of criticism can be benumbed by the paralysis of custom. Adhesion to prejudice is too often mistaken for love of truth.

I shall not stop to show how often, or by what partisans, the external evidence has been mis-stated. One of the most recent commentators, for instance, has prefixed to the Epistle the clause of Origen, that "It is not by haphazard that ancient authorities have handed it down as St. Paul's." He omits to inform us that Origen in the very next words says that "God only knows the truth as to who wrote it," and that though some of his predecessors had held it to be St. Paul's, yet the historical tradition (*ἱστορία*) which had come to him asserted it to be the work of St. Clement or St. Luke. It may be worth while, then, once more to

Rom. xiii. 1—7, "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God."	Wisd. vi. 1—4, "For power is given unto you (Kings, &c.) from the Lord, and sovereignty from the highest."

See Hilgenfeld, *Einleit.* 223.

summarise, and to put in its true perspective the evidence of the Fathers.[1]

This evidence may be placed in the Excursus. But we may here most briefly summarise it by saying that in spite of the antiquity and authority of the Epistle no writer of the Western Church in the first, second, or third century quotes it as St. Paul's; that the first Latin writer who attributes it to St. Paul is Hilary, late in the fourth century; and that in the fifth century both St. Jerome and St. Augustine, though loosely quoting it as St. Paul's, had serious misgivings about its direct genuineness. In the Eastern Church, Pantænus and Clemens of Alexandria seem to have set the fashion of accepting the Pauline authorship;[2] but on this subject even Origen felt grave doubts. Eusebius wavered about it, and admitted that the Epistle was accounted spurious by many, but thought that it might perhaps be a translation from an Aramaic original. Even in the Eastern Church it did not meet with unhesitating acceptance as a work of St. Paul.

A Jewish rule, which has found unconscious acceptance in all ages, says that "Custom is as Law."[3] But if the Epistle to the Hebrews owes its recognition among the Epistles of St. Paul far more to an unthinking custom than to careful argument, how is it that such a custom arose? The answer is simple. It arose mainly in the Eastern Church from the initiative of Pantænus, and it was only accepted in the Western Church, after considerable hesitation, by the force of example. In both Churches it originated not from

[1] See Excursus VIII. on the "Patristic Evidence as to the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews."

[2] See Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i. 472, 480.

[3] מנהג כדין

trustworthy tradition, but from the superficial acceptance of *primâ facie* phenomena. The general theology of the Epistle was Pauline, and the finer differences escaped notice. Many characteristic phrases coincided with those in St. Paul's Epistles, and were current in his school of thought. The allusions at the close of the Epistle led to the careless assumption that they were penned by St. Paul. The observation of similarities is easy to any one; the detection of differences, which, however deep, are yet to some extent latent, is only possible to students who do not rely upon authority and tradition except so far as they are elements in the sacred search for truth. Nothing can more decisively prove the incompetence of a mechanical consensus than the fact that millions of readers have failed to perceive, even in the original, the dissimilarity of style, of method, and of theologic thought, which proves that the same pen could not have written, nor the same mind have originated, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of St. Paul. Luther showed his usual insight and robust sense when he saw that Heb. ii. 3 could not have been written by the author of Gal. i. 1, 12. Again, though the author does *not* fall into any *demonstrable* error in his allusions to the details of Temple worship in vii. 27, ix. 3, 4, x. 11—yet he goes to the verge of apparent inaccuracies, against which St. Paul, who was familiar with the Temple service, would surely have guarded himself. In reading the Epistle to the Hebrews we are in contact with the mind of a great and original writer of the Apostolic age, whose name escaped discovery till modern times.

It is hardly worth while to quote later authorities. They can have no effect but to impose upon the

ignorant. They simply float with the stream. They are uncritical, and therefore valueless. When such writers as Clemens of Alexandria and Origen in the Eastern Church, and Jerome and Augustine in the Western Church, had made timid concessions to the custom of popularly quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's, it was natural that later writers should follow their example. Gradually, by the aid of conciliar decrees,[1] prevalent assumption hardened into ecclesiastical conviction. The result of the evidence may be summed up by saying that, as far as the evidence of antiquity is concerned, loose conjecture tended in one direction and genuine criticism in the other. It is astonishing that any one should attach importance to the conventional allusions of writers who neither discussed nor considered the question. That this or that Father of the fourth or fifth century introduces a quotation from the Epistle with the words "St. Paul says" is of no more consequence than when this or that clergyman announces a lesson or a sermon from "the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews." Such "patristic authorities" are, for any *critical* purpose, not worth the paper on which they are written. The acceptance of a current view by a writer who has not examined the question has no evidential weight, even if that author be an Athanasius or a Theodoret.

But among thoughtful writers who really turned their attention to the matter the old doubts on the

[1] The first Synod which used the Epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline was that of Antioch, A.D. 264, which was summoned to correct the errors of Paul of Samosata. It is placed tenth among St. Paul's Epistles by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363 (*Can.* 60). This canon appears to be genuine (Wiesler, i. 23), though not above suspicion. (Credner, *Gesch. d. Kanon*, 21 *fg.*)

subject were by no means extinguished. In the Western Church the Epistle was not publicly read to the same extent or on the same footing as the others, even at the close of the fourth century. The assertion that it was written by St. Paul was sometimes accompanied with modifications, in the fifth century. It had never been commented on by any Latin writer as late as the sixth. In the seventh, Isidore of Seville records that many still attributed it, at least in part, to Barnabas or Clement "because of the discrepancy of style." Even in the ninth it is entirely omitted by the Codex Boernerianus (G), and only appears in a Latin translation in the celebrated F, the Codex Augiensis. But long before the ninth century, and for centuries afterwards, the science of criticism was forgotten. St. Thomas of Aquinum, in the thirteenth century, repeats the old objections in order to refute them by the old arguments; but all doubt on the subject was lulled to sleep by the spell of ecclesiastical infallibility. Then came the reviving dawn of the sixteenth century, when "Greece rose from the dead with the New Testament in her hand." At that epoch even Roman Catholic writers like Ludovicus Vives and Cardinal Cajetan ventured to point out the uncertainty which had been felt by Origen, Jerome, and even Augustine. Erasmus, while confessing his willingness to accept any certain definition of the Church on the subject, yet quotes some of the Fathers to show the absurdity of the pseudo-orthodoxy which condemned a man as "plusquam heretical" if he doubted about the authorship of this Epistle. His own opinion was that St. Paul did not write it.[1] Luther

[1] "Quod ad sensum meum attinet, non videtur illius esse, ob causas quas hic reticuisse praestiterit."—Erasm. *Opp.* vi. 1024.

calls attention to its style, and quotes various passages[1] to show that it *could* not have been written by St. Paul, or by any Apostle. While speaking of it with admiration as "a strong, mighty, and lofty Epistle," he considers that its Scriptural method indicates the authorship of Apollos, and says that at any rate it is the work of "an excellent apostolic man."[2] Calvin, again—while, like some of the Fathers, he *popularly* quotes it as "the Apostle's"—says that he cannot be induced to recognise it as St. Paul's because it differs from him in its style and method of teaching, and because the writer speaks of himself as a pupil of the Apostles,[3] a thing very alien from St. Paul's custom.[4] Melancthon never quotes it as St. Paul's. The Magdeburg Centuriators denied that it was his. Grotius and Limborch and Le Clerc supposed it to have been written by St. Luke, Apollos, or some companion of St. Paul.

Then for a time the tyranny of indolent custom began once more to reassert itself. During the seventeenth century, and long afterwards, especially in England, no one, without incurring dislike and suspicion, could hint, even apologetically, at any doubt as to whether the translators of the English Bible were in the right when they headed the Epistle with the superscription, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews."[5] But

[1] ii. 3; vi. 4, *seq.*; x. 26, *seq.*; xii. 17.

[2] He only gives it precedence over the Epistles of James and Jude. "Lutherus eam simpliciter rejicit atque ita fere sentiunt Lutherani."—Gerhard († 1637), *Comment.* p. 10.

[3] Heb. ii. 3.

[4] Gal. i. 11—15; ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xi. 23; Eph. iii. 2, &c. See Calvin, *ad Heb.* ii. 3; xii. 13.

[5] "St. Paul saith in the twelfth chapter of the Hebrews" (Office *for the Visitation of the Sick*). "Marriage is commended of St. Paul to be

since the time of Semler (1763) many eminent writers have practically set the question at rest by furnishing the results of that close examination, which prove not only that St. Paul was not the actual *writer* of the Epistle—a fact which had been patent even in the days of Origen—but that it is not even indirectly due to his authorship. The phraseology has been passed through a fresh mint, and the thoughts have been subjected to the crucible of another individuality.

It will, therefore, serve no purpose to heap up words and phrases which are common to the author and to St. Paul.[1] Many, indeed, of those which have been adduced belong to the current coin of Christian theology. Those that *are* distinctively Pauline only prove a point which everyone is ready to concede, that

honourable of all men" (Heb. xiii. 4), (Office *Form for the Solemnisation of Matrimony*). Such accidental allusions are in no sense authoritative. This is exactly a question on which Councils and Churches are very fallible, and have no authority beyond that which they derive from the study and research of their individual members. These *obiter dicta* have no more weight in proving the Pauline authorship than the insertions of 1 John v. 7 in the English version has weight in deciding on the authenticity of that passage. On such matters the Church of the seventeenth century was less qualified to decide than the Church of the nineteenth and if the learned divines of the Church were now called upon for an opinion, the preponderance against the Pauline authorship would be overwhelming. To use such casual allusions as though they were decisive, in this and similar discussions, is one of the most unworthy—and therefore, alas! one of the commonest—forms of the *reductio ad horribile* and the *mentum ad invidiam.*

[1] Some of these may be seen collected by Tholuck and Bishop Wordsworth in their introductions to the Epistle, as also in the editions of Stuart and Forster. Any one will see at a glance the large sifting they require. I subjoin some of the most striking—1 Thess. i. 3, "unceasingly making mention of your work of faith and labour of love;" Heb. vi. 10, "*God is not unjust to forget your work and love;*" Rom. xii. 18, "if possible, being at peace with all men;" Heb. xii. 14, "*Follow peace with all.*" Compare also Heb. xiii. 18 with 2 Cor. iv. 2; Heb. x. 30 with Rom. xii. 19; Heb. ii. 10 with Rom. xi. 36; and Heb. xiii. 20 with Rom. xv. 33.

the writer had adopted much of the Apostle's teaching, and had been deeply influenced by his companionship. It is this very fact which throws into relief the positive dissimilarities. The more we read such books as Mr. Forster's *Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* "the closer," says Alford, "becomes the connexion in faith and feeling of the writer of the Epistle and St. Paul, but the more absolutely incompatible the personal identity; the more we perceive all that region of thought and feeling to have been in common between them which mere living together, talking together, praying together would naturally range in; but all that region wherein individual peculiarity is wont to put itself forth, to have been entirely distinct."

Again, it is vain to talk about difference of subject or difference of aim as furnishing any explanation of these dissimilarities. We have writings of St. Paul on all kinds of topics, and at all ages of his mature life; and though the style of a writer may vary in different moods, as the style of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians differs from that in the Pastoral Epistles, yet every style retains a certain stamp of individuality. Now, the differences between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of St. Paul are differences which go down to the roots of the being. That the same pen should have been engaged on both is a psychological impossibility. The Greek is far better than the Greek of St. Paul.[1] St. Paul is often stately-

[1] This does not exclude Hebraisms, because *lexical* Hebraisms (such as *κληρονόμος, οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, ἁγιάζειν, σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, κ.τ.λ.*) were inwoven into the theological language of Christianity; but the majority of the *grammatical* "Hebraisms" in Prof. Stuart's list are not Hebraisms at all, or are reminiscences of Old Testament expressions (see Tholuck, *Komment* 26—30). Bleek and Tholuck select six special peculiarities of

and often rhetorical, and sometimes writes more in the style of a treatise than of a letter; but the stateliness and rhetoric and systematic treatment of the Epistle to the Hebrews in no way resemble his. The form and rhythm of its sentences are wholly different. Paul is often impassioned and often argumentative, and so is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but the passion and the dialectics of the latter furnish the most striking contrast to those of the former. The writer cites differently from St. Paul;[1] he writes differently; he argues differently; he thinks differently; he declaims differently; he constructs and connects his sentences differently;[2] he builds up his paragraphs on a wholly different model. St. Paul is constantly mingling two constructions, leaving sentences unfinished, breaking into personal allusions, substituting the syllogism of passion for the syllogism of logic. This writer is never ungrammatical; he is never irregular; he is never personal; he never struggles for expression; he never loses himself in a parenthesis; he is never hurried

style—1. The constant use of πᾶς, "all;" 2. The intransitive use of καθίζειν, "sit" (i. 3; viii. 1, etc.); 3. The use of ἐάνπερ, "even though," where St. Paul always uses εἴγε, "if at least;" 4. ὅθεν, in the sense of "wherefore;" 5. εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς, "to perpetuity," and εἰς τὸ παντελὲς (Heb. vii. 3, 10, 25, etc.) for St. Paul's πάντοτε, "always," which is not a good Greek word; 6. The use of παρὰ and ὑπὲρ after comparatives.

[1] He follows the LXX., and usually the *Alexandrian* form of it, even where it differs from the Hebrew (i. 8, 9; ii. 7; x. 5—7, 30, 37—38; xi. 21; xiii. 5); whereas St. Paul often reverts to the Hebrew, and his citations agree with the *Vatican* MS. of the LXX. See this demonstrated by Bleek, *Der Brief an d. Hebr.* 338, *seq.*; Tholuck, *Komment.* 55. And he introduces his quotations all but invariably, not by "as it is written," "the Scripture saith," or "David so saith," but by "He saith," or "the Holy Spirit *or* God saith *or* beareth witness," etc. (i. 5, 6; iii. 7, 15; iv. 3, 4; v. 5; vi. 14; vii. 14, 21; viii. 5, 8, etc.).

[2] Γάρ, τοιγοροῦν, καὶ γάρ, τοίνυν, διό, ἀλλὰ οὐ (ii. 16 and iii. 16); εἶτα (xii. 9) δήπου (ii. 16). See Bleek, i. 330.

into an anacoluthon.[1] His style is the style of a man of genius who thinks as well as writes in Greek: whereas St. Paul wrote in Greek, but thought in Syriac. The writings of both have the indefinable stamp of distinction; but the distinction of Apollos is marked by a less burning passion, and a more absolute self-control. The notion that the Epistle is a translation may be set aside. It only arose from a desire to save the Pauline authorship while accounting for the glaring differences of style. The fact of its acceptance by writer after writer[2] shows that criticism had little to do with deciding on the peculiarities of the letter. The quotations from the Septuagint even where it differs from the Hebrew, the structure of the sentences, and even the use of the *two* senses of the word *diatheke,* are sufficient to prove that the letter was written in Greek. A translation may be very able, but it can never bear upon its surface such marks of originality as we find in this Epistle. Its eloquence belongs to the language in which it is composed.[3] It is as unlike the eloquence of the LXX. translators when they are rendering into Greek the promises and denunciations of the Hebrew prophets as it is possible to conceive. It is full of paronomasiæ and plays of words which could have had

[1] How totally unlike St. Paul's rugged impetuosity is the calm and masterly grasp over the grammar in the splendid paragraph of xii. 18—24, in spite of its double parentheses! St. Paul would have made shipwreck of the grammar in such a sentence.

[2] Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, Euthalius, Œcumenius, Theophylact, etc., and down to Thomas Aquinas.

[3] Thus Philastrius (*Haer.* 89) says of some, "In eâ (epistolâ) quia rhetorice scripsit, sermone plausibili, inde non putant esse ejusdem apostoli." The emphatic and sounding uses of the hyperbaton in vii. 4 (the position of ὁ πατριάρχης) could not be paralleled in St. Paul; nor the strikingly effective collocation of words in the very first sentence, in xii. 1, 2 ix. 11, 12, etc.

no meaning or parallel in Hebrew.[1] It abounds in words which, while they have not the startling life of St. Paul's—while they are neither half-battles nor "creatures with hands and feet"—are yet terse, beautiful, and essentially Greek.[2] It could not have been a version from an Aramaic original. If then the Greek be the Greek of the original author, it is wholly unlike St. Paul's Greek. It was not in St. Paul's nature to be, as this writer is, "elaborately and faultlessly rhetorical." St. Paul, as I have shown elsewhere, has his own style of rhetoric, breathless, impetuous, bursting out like a lava stream of spontaneous passion. But never under any circumstances does St. Paul use rhetoric for its own sake. Never does he look out for expressions which shall merely please by their own sonorous majesty. Never does he indulge in the balanced equilibrium of euphonious clauses. His expressions are never leisurely. The movement of this author is that of an Oriental sheikh with his robes of honour wrapped around him; the movement of St. Paul is that of an athlete girded for the race. The rhetoric of this writer, even when it is at its most majestic volume, is like the smooth flow of a river amid green fields; the rhetoric of St. Paul is like the rush of a mountain torrent amid opposing rocks.

The idiosyncrasy of the writer is seen in his fond-

[1] i. 1, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*; ii. 5—8, *ὑπέταξεν . . . ἀνυπότακτον . . . ὑποτεταγμένα*; v. 8, *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*; v. 14 *καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*; ix. 8, *ἐπὶ βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν*; xiii. 14, *μένουσαν . . . μέλλουσαν*; ix. 15, *διαθήκη* (in two senses, "a covenant" and "a will"); vii. 39 *μετέσχηκεν . . . προσέσχηκεν*; x. 29, *ἡγησάμενος . . . ἡγιάσθη*; xi. 9, *παρῴκησεν . . . κατοικήσας*; xiii. 2, *ἐπιλανθάνεσθε . . . ἔλαθον*; and many instances of plays on compound words (ii. 8; vii. 23, 24; viii. 7, 8; ix. 28), besides numerous rhetorical assonances (vii. 19, 22; x. 29, 34, 38, 39, etc.).

[2] i. 3, *ἀπαύγασμα*; xii. 1, *εὐπερίστατος*; v. 2, *μετριοπαθεῖν*.

ness for amplitude and rotundity of expression. Where St. Paul uses "reward" (*misthos*) his ear requires "recompense of reward" (*misthapodosia*); where St. Paul would have been content with the word "blood" (*haima*) he requires "shedding of blood" (*haimatecchusia*); where St. Paul has "oath" (*horkos*) he uses the fuller and rounder *horkomosia*. St. Paul thrice employs the expression "sitting at the right hand of God;" this writer, perhaps also with a touch of the Alexandrian dislike of anthropomorphism, thrice amplifies it into sat[1] "on the right hand of the *Majesty in the highest*," or "on the right hand of *the throne of God*," or "on the right hand of *the throne of the Majesty in the heavens*." St. Paul speaks of Christ as "the image of God," this writer as "the effulgence of the glory and impress of the hypostasis of God."[2] All this arises from his love for "musical euphony." On the other hand, St. Paul rarely speaks, as this writer usually does, of our Lord as "Jesus," or "the Lord," or "Christ," but rather of "our Lord Jesus Christ," and "Christ Jesus our Lord."[3] The variation is remarkable, but is due to the fact that as time went on the names "Christ" and "Jesus" became to all Christians so connotative of the supremest exaltation as no longer to need that addition or description which had become familiar to the earlier converts.

[1] Καθίζειν, "to sit," is intransitive in Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2. In St. Paul it is always transitive, "to seat."

[2] See Alford, IV. i. p. 79.

[3] These compound forms occur sixty-eight times in St. Paul, and even "our Lord Jesus" only once in the Hebrews.

CHAPTER XVI.

THEOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

"Oh, that I knew how all Thy lights combine,
And the configurations of their glorie,
Seeing not only how each verse doth shine,
But all the constellations of the storie."

G. Herbert.

But the importance of all these differences, great as it is, sinks into insignificance when we consider the deep distinctions which exist between the *theological conceptions* of St. Paul and those of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is, it need scarcely be said, no contradiction, any more than there is a contradiction between the theology of St. Paul and St. John; but there is a dissimilarity so marked that, as St. Paul could not have written the Epistle to the Hebrews without a radical change of style and individuality, so neither could he have written it without completely shifting the perspective and the inter-relations of the truths which he habitually taught. These facts are so interesting, so convincing, so intrinsically important, and so frequently overlooked that they deserve the reader's most careful consideration.

(1.) That the writer was of the *School* of St. Paul we have said already, and accordingly we find him dwelling on three cardinal topics of the Pauline theology, namely, (1) the contrast between Judaism and Christianity, (2) the saving efficacy of faith, and (3) the redemptive

work of Christ. But the fourth great topic of St. Paul's teaching—namely, the Universality of the Gospel as offered to all men, and to the Gentile in no less degree than to the Jew—is conspicuously absent in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

"*The people*" is to our author repeatedly, and, so far as this Epistle is concerned, exclusively, the Chosen People.[1] The Gentiles are ignored. The word "Gentiles" does not occur in the Epistle; and the writer speaks as though there were no such thing as a pagan in the world.[2] No one, surely, can refuse to recognise this phenomenon, or will think that it is sufficiently explained by saying that the Epistle is "addressed to the Hebrews." That might account for the absence of any *discussion* of the relations between the two unfused, and even half-discordant, elements of the Christian Church; but St. Paul, with whom the offer of salvation to the Gentiles was the most essential element of "his Gospel,"[3] could not have excluded every allusion to them, however remote. Had he done so by way of deference to Jewish prejudices, it would have been a concession altogether unworthy. That this writer accepted the call of the Gentiles we do not dispute; had he not done so he could not have been, as he so

[1] Ὁ λαός, v. 3; vii. 5, 11, 27; viii. 10; ix. 7, 19; x. 30; xi. 25. See especially ii. 17; iv. 9; xiii. 12. In this sense the writer (as we should have supposed *à priori*) is a Jewish Christian; but he is a Jewish Christian of a large and liberal type, and he does not utter one word which is antagonistic to the great spiritual conceptions of St. Paul. He dwells emphatically on the imperfection of Judaism (ἀσθενὲς. . . ἀνωφελές); places Abraham below Melchizedek; does not dwell on Christ either as the Jewish Messiah, or as the Son of David; and places the attainment of salvation in faithful endurance, not in obedience to the Law.

[2] See Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* ii. 289.

[3] Eph. iii. 4—8.

evidently was, a friend and adherent of the great Apostle. But it was not a topic of which his thoughts were full to overflowing, as were the thoughts of St. Paul. It was not a truth for the sake of which he had spent, amid combat, calumny, and persecution, the best years of his life. His thoughts were so exclusively occupied with the Hebrews, that he even speaks of the Incarnation as a taking hold not of humanity, but of Abraham's seed.[1] It is, perhaps, this circumstance which has robbed us of that enquiry into the position of Heathenism in the Divine economy, which would not only have had an intense interest, but would have completed for us the now imperfect scheme of what may be called the philosophy of historic religion.

But while the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had evidently embraced the views of St. Paul, how differently does he handle the three great themes which he has in common with his predecessor! His whole Epistle deals with *the relations between Christianity and Judaism*, but it is doubtful whether, at earlier stages of the controversy, St. Paul would have thought it expedient to adopt his line of argument. It is one which was in itself admirably suited to pacify the furious indignation of his Jewish opponents; but rougher and sterner work had to be done before it could be profitably employed. Jewish exclusiveness had taken refuge in what they regarded as the impregnable fortress of Levitism; and it was necessary to batter down that fortress with many a rude shock of argument before the Apostle could pause to show the beauty and past usefulness of its walls and towers. Similarly there can be no question that the

[1] See ii. 16.

Papacy had in its day rendered magnificent services to the cause of civilisation; but it is scarcely from the Reformers that we should have expected a demonstration that it did so. It was their appointed task to show the dangerous elements which, in the sixteenth century, had rendered it necessary to emancipate mankind from its oppressive sway. There is force and truth in the arguments of De Maistre, but it was not a Luther who could be expected to originate them.

The specific character of the argument cannot be more briefly described than by saying, as we have said already, that it is Alexandrian. It is not only Alexandrian in its learning and culture,[1] but has its bases in the Alexandrian theosophy, and appeals for support to the allegoric method of Alexandrian exegesis.[2] St. Paul was no stranger to that method; but his approaches to it are distant and external. They are of the nature of literary reminiscences. They tinge the phraseology rather than sway the entire conception. They are such as had flowed from Alexandria into the field of Palestinian thought. On the other hand, the Alexandrianism of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that of one who had been trained in the system, and whose whole theology is influenced by the conceptions which he has thence acquired.

I will try to make this clear.

a. We have already touched upon the exclusive regard paid to the Chosen People. The writer's thoughts are absorbed in the Hebrews. It is the

[1] Instances will be frequently found in the notes to the following pages. See also Excursus IX., "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Writings of Philo."

[2] iv. 1—10; vii. 1—17; ix. 1—10; x. 1—10.

same with Philo. His cosmopolitan interests and encyclopædic training had made him familiar with Roman institutions and Greek culture; yet everything appears to him in the light of Hebraism. Moses is to him the ultimate source of all wisdom. Philo was as ardently convinced as the fiercest of the Zealots that Israel is the leader of the Gentiles, and that to Israel belongs the future of the world. Israel is to the nations as the Pillar of Fire, wherein the Logos, or some other Divine minister, led their fathers in the wilderness. Israel, with his Temple and his laws, is the priest to pray and intercede for the seventy nations of mankind. The souls of the Israelites are of a higher order than those of the heathen. To Philo the Messianic kingdom means mainly the assembling of the Dispersion by some new and personal manifestation of the Logos.[1] To him Judaism means Philosophy, but he still regards it as the absolute religion. Similarly, to the writer of this Epistle Christianity is but the fulfilment of Judaism. He sees in all mankind the undeveloped germs of the ideal Hebrew.

β. Another marked trace of the writer's Alexandrianism is his method of treating Scripture. To him, as to Philo, it is pregnant with *latent* meanings. Its silence is divinely significant, and is indeed as important for instruction as are its utterances. On two passing and isolated allusions to Melchizedek, allusions separated from each other by an interval of nine centuries, he builds a theological system of unequalled grandeur. That system receives strong support from the import and omen of names. It is partly built on the fact that

[1] For these allusions see Philo, *Vita Mosis*, *Opp.* ii. 104, 107, 124, 126, 155 (ed. Mangey); and Hausrath, *Die Zeit d. Apost.* 181.

certain circumstances are *not* mentioned in the Sacred narrative. Similarly, from the absence of any reference to the death of Cain, Philo infers the deathlessness of evil in mortal life. He calls Sarah "without mother" because the name of her mother is not recorded. So, to the writer of this Epistle, the mystic splendour of Melchizedek is enhanced by the circumstance that he is "without father, without mother, without recorded genealogy."

γ. But again and again, in peculiar phrases and pregnant hints, we see how much the writer has benefited from the study of Philo. If his main argument turns on the Priesthood of Christ, and His *sinless* Priesthood, we cannot forget that Philo too has called the Logos a High Priest, an "image of God," and "first-born of God," and has spoken of his having "no participation in sin."[1] Philo as well as St. Paul has contrasted the milk and the solid food of religious instruction. If Apollos speaks of Christ's sitting on the right hand of God to make intercession for us, Philo too has spoken of the Logos as "a Priest of the Father of the Universe;" as "an Advocate to obtain both forgiveness of sins and a supply of all good;" as "the boundary between created things and the Creator;" as "an intercessor for mortality in its longings after the incorruptible, and an ambassador from the Lord of all to that which is His subject." These are but some of the memorable ways in which, by God's gradual education of mankind, Alexandrian Judaism was enlightened to create forms of thought of which Christianity could make use in proclaiming the Gospel of the Incarnation, and in basing it upon the utterances of the

[1] *De profugis*, 20 ἀρχιερεὺς . . . ἁμαρτημάτων ἀμέτοχος.

Old Testament Scriptures.[1] But we must again be reminded how vast is the superiority of the Christian faith to the Philonian philosophy. The Logos of Philo has to be removed from any direct contact with matter by an endless number of intervening Powers; the forms in which He is represented are so self-contradictory, that we never know whether He is to be regarded as a Person or an Idea. And Philo is still so far entangled in Jewish particularism that he is unable to understand the universal prophecies of the Old Testament. His Logos is, at the best a Jewish deliverer, and is infinitely far from being the Saviour of the World.

δ. But the still closer comparison of a few of the most memorable passages of the Epistle with the words and thoughts of Philo will show that the author is indebted to him to an extent to which St. Paul's writings furnish no parallel.

(i.) Take, for instance, the memorable opening passage. He speaks of Christ as "*the effulgence of God's glory.*" Philo had spoken of God as the "archetypal brightness," and of the Logos as a "sunlike brightness," and the Book of Wisdom had spoken of Wisdom as "the effulgence of everlasting light."—He calls the Son "*the stamp and impress of God's substance.*" Philo speaks of the word of man as "the stamp of divine power," and of the Logos as "the stamp of the seal of God."—He says

[1] Among phrases common to the writer and to Philo, but unknown to St. Paul, we may mention—*δήπου, τοσοῦτο . . ὅσον*, the interchange of meanings between "covenant" and "testament" in *diatheke*, *φωτίζειν, γεύσασθαι, μετριοπαθεῖν, ἀμήτωρ*. There is a remarkable parallel between Heb. x. 29 and Philo, *De profug.*, "For if those who abuse mortal parents are led to death, *of what punishment must we think them worthy* who venture to blaspheme the Father and Maker of all things?" Such striking terms as "to sin willingly" and "prayers and supplications" are also common to both.

U 2

that the Son "*upholds all things by the utterance of His power.*" Philo speaks of the Logos as "bearing all things that are."—He says, "*By whom also He made the worlds.*" Philo says that "the instrument (*organon*) of creation was the Word, by Whom it was set in order," and that "the Word is the image (*eikon*) of God, by Whom the whole universe was fashioned."[1]

(ii.) Again, take Heb. iv. 12, 13: "*For living is the Word of God, and active, and more cutting than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the division both of soul and spirit, both of joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart.*" In this passage the writer evidently has in his mind the thoughts of Philo and of the Book of Wisdom. Philo compares the Word to the flaming sword of Paradise; he speaks of the "fire and knife" of Abraham as being used "to cut off and consume his still adherent mortality." He calls the Word "the cutter of all things," and says that "when whetted to the utmost sharpness it is incessantly dividing all sensuous things." He compares it to the midmost branch of the golden candlestick, as being the cutter or divider of the six faculties of the human soul. Similarly the author of Wisdom compares God's Almighty word to a sharp sword leaping down from earth to Heaven.[2]

(iii.) Again, this Epistle is remarkable for several passages which express with uncompromising sternness the hopeless condition of willing and determined apostates. Those passages (vi. 4—8; x. 26—29; xii. 16, 17)

[1] *De monarchia*, ii. § 5 (Mang. i. 47, 106—162, &c.).

[2] See Excursus IX. *Quis rer. div. haer.* (Mang. i. 491, 503, 506).

are in some respects unique in Scripture, and they furnished a stronghold to the heretics of the religiosity which delights in hatred. That they do not sanction such perversions we shall see further on; but we find something very analogous to them in a passage of Philo[1] which is almost apostolic in its solemnity, where he describes the irreparable loss sustained by that soul which refuses to submit itself to the discipline of the Logos and which overpasses the limits of fitting humility. "Such a soul," he says, "will not only be widowed in respect to all true knowledge, but will also be cast out. Once unyoked and separated from the Logos, she will be cast away for ever, without possibility of returning to her ancient home."[2]

After instances so striking, it will be needless to do more than to point to two of the most fundamental conceptions in the entire Epistle.

1. One of them is the Melchizedek Priesthood of Christ. In his whole treatment of the subject, the writer adopts the method and the thoughts of Philo. Philo speaks of the "Just King," as holding "a self-acquired, self-taught priesthood," which—building solely on the *silence* of Scripture—he describes as having been bestowed on him without merit or work. He directly compares him to the Logos in the words, "The Logos, *who is shadowed forth by Melchizedek*," is "priest of God the Most High." Philo also speaks of the Logos as "the great High Priest."[3]

[1] *Legg. alleg.* iii. (Mang. i. 119; δυσελπιστίαν μετὰ πολλῆς ἀνίας κτᾶται κ.τ.λ.).

[2] Delitzsch, on Heb. vi. 4. On the resemblance between this Epistle and Philo, see Excursus IX., and consult Carpzov, *Sacr. Exerc. in Ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone*, 1750; Lösner, *Observ. in N. T. ex Philone*; Bleek, i. 399, *fg.*; Tholuck, 78, *fg.*; Gfrörer, *l.c.*; Dähne, *Alex. Religionsphilos.* i.

[3] *De Somn.* § 38 (Mang. i. 653).

But here again, as throughout the Epistle, the writer shows himself superior to Philo. With Philo allegory is everything, and the literal narrative almost nothing. With Apollos the literal narrative is accepted, and the typology is confined within rational limits, not pushed into absurd details. He does not say, as Philo does, that Melchizedek brought forth the nourishment for the soul which the Ammonites and Moabites would not do, because the Ammonites are the children only of perception, and the Moabites of mind.[1]

2. But there is a yet more fundamental Alexandrianism in his mode of thought, and one which requires a fuller examination.

It had been a main object of St. Paul to dissuade the Jews from clinging to Judaic observances as a means of salvation; to prevent their enforcement upon the Gentiles; and to convince the Gentiles that they were abrogated and null. He does this by a dialectic method, in which he proves to the Jews that Mosaism was but a transient, imperfect, relative dispensation, having no absolute value, but only intended to lead men by an unsatisfied yearning, or rather to drive them with the scourge of an awakened conscience, to a diviner and an eternal faith. To him the Law is neither Promise nor Fulfilment, but a stern though necessary discipline which had been interposed between the two. Moses, in the Apostle's view, was by no means the supreme chief of the Hebrew race, but a personage of secondary importance in comparison with Abraham. The fiery Law of Sinai, so far from being, as the Rabbis said, the one thing for the

[1] Tholuck points out that in the Hagadoth about the infancy of Moses the writer is nearer to Josephus (*Antt.* xv. 563) than to Philo.

sake of which the universe had been created,[1] was deposed into complete subordination. St. Paul placed it immeasurably lower than the Promise to Abraham, and showed that it shrank into insignificance before the Gospel of Christ. Hence the contrast between the Law and the Gospel is, for St. Paul, a contrast between Command and Promise, between Sin and Mercy, between Works and Faith, between Curse and Blessing, between the threat of inevitable Death and the gift of Eternal Life. Apollos, on the other hand, treats of the contrast only as a contrast between Type and Reality. The polemical aspect of the question has disappeared. The Circumcision controversy, the question about meats,[2] the proofs that the Gentiles were not to be under Levitic bondage, are matters that have no existence in his pages. He does not say one word about that opposition of Faith and Works which occupies so many chapters of St. Paul. Election, Regeneration, the Rejection of Israel, the difference between the physical and the spiritual seed of Israel, are absent from his treatise. He only alludes even to Repentance and to the Resurrection to class them among the "elements" which he may safely pass by.[3] To St. Paul Judaism was represented by a Law which enforced, by one universal menace, its impossible exactions; it was a dispensation of wrath which revealed to man that he was naturally under the curse of God.

[1] See the Introd. to Delitzsch's Commentary on the Epistle, and Kitzur Sh'lh, *f.* 7, 2 (Hershon's *Talm. Miscell.* p. 331). Avoda Zara, *f.* 3, 1. Shabbath, *f.* 89, 1. Pesachim, *f.* 54, 1, etc.

[2] There is a passing allusion to the distinction of meats in xiii. 9, but only as it affected the Jews, and with no reference to its present obligatoriness or non-obligatoriness either for them or for the Gentiles.

[3] vi. 1.

Christianity, on the other hand, was represented by a Deliverance, a Reconciliation, a Free Grace which men were forced to seek as a refuge from a doom which their troubled consciences declared to be deserved. This Epistle views the two religions under an aspect entirely different. It sees in Judaism *not so much a Law as a System of Worship*, of which Christianity was the antitype and fulfilment. Both writers arrive at the same conclusion, but they do so by different routes, and from different premisses. St. Paul represents Mosaism as a cancelled servitude; this writer as an incomplete satisfaction. To St. Paul the Levitic system was a discipline which had been rendered superfluous; to this writer—to whom by anticipation I will again ask permission to give the name of Apollos—it was a symbol which had become nugatory. To St. Paul the Law was a bond, of which Christ had nailed the torn fragments to His Cross; to Apollos Judaism was a scaffolding within which the true Temple had been built, a chrysalis from which the winged life had departed. St. Paul looked on Mosaism as a broken fetter, his follower regarded it as a vanished shadow. To St. Paul the Law was abrogated because it consisted of "beggarly elements;" to Apollos it was annulled because the Priesthood on which it depended had become weak and profitless. Both regarded Christianity as far more ancient than Judaism—but it was so to St. Paul because he saw in it the fulfilment of a Promise; and to Apollos because he saw in it the realisation or an archetype. St. Paul's proof hinges on the threat which lay by implication in the words: *He that doeth them shall live by them;* the argument of Apollos rests on the command to Moses: "*See that thou make all*

things after the pattern shewed thee in the Mount." St. Paul proves the independence of Christianity by referring to Abraham; Apollos by referring to Melchizedek. The Jewish ritual was to Apollos a material something between the Divine Idea and its partial realisation by Christians upon earth, until they passed to its absolute realisation in Heaven. Hence, "the Epistle to the Hebrews is a thoroughly original attempt to establish the main results of Paulinism upon new presuppositions and in an entirely independent way."[1] We may add that this way, being more comprehensible, was of the extremest importance. It was clearer to the Gentiles because it did not involve the transcendental heights of St. Paul's fervid mysticism. It was more easily accepted by Jews because it gave a less violent shock to their prejudices. It soothed the wounded pride of Levitism, by recognising it as part of an unbroken continuity.[2] The Jew was less likely to cling with frantic patriotism to the traditions of his fathers if he could be persuaded that Christianity was not in opposition to them, but might be regarded as a progress beyond them, an evolution out of them, a nearer approximation to the Eternal Substance of which they were the acknowledged but evanescent shadow.[3]

[1] Pfleiderer, *Paulinism.* ii. 53.

[2] This may be illustrated from the writer's treatment of Revelation. Here again we find the *argumentum a minori ad majus.* The Revelation to the Jews (πάλαι) was in all respects a genuine revelation (i. 1; ii. 2; iii. 9; iv. 12; xii. 19, etc.), but the Instrument of the Christian Revelation was higher and greater (i. 1; ii. 3)—One far above angels, far above Moses, far above Aaron; and He spoke not in terror, as on Sinai, but in mercy, as by the Galilean Lake (xii. 18—21; iii. 7; iv. 1, etc.).

[3] The whole subject has been well treated by Baur (*Church History*, I., pp. 114—122, E.T.) and by Pfleiderer (*Paulinismus*, Kap. ix.), to whom I am much indebted. Baur says (p. 118)—"The distinction between the two views may be said to be that the tendency of St. Paul's is *ethical*, that

And yet how effective the argument was! The Temple seems to rise before us in all the splendour of its most imposing ceremonial. We see the Ark and the Cherubim and Aaron's budding rod, and the golden pot of manna, and the curling wreaths of incense. We hear the trumpets blow, and see the Levites in their white tunics on the marble steps, and the High Priest in his golden and jewelled robes. And while the Jew is exulting in all this gorgeous and significant ritual, it is by one wave of a wand reduced to a shadow, a picture, a transient symbol of that by which it is all to be done away!

For the main section of the Epistle is occupied with the proof that Christ is the true Priest, who continues indeed the Aaronic priesthood, but supersedes it by reverting to a higher type; that Judaism is but an inchoate and imperfect Christianity. The difference between the two systems is quantitative rather than qualitative, though quantitative in an almost infinite degree. The ancient novice, when initiated into the mysteries, used to exclaim, ἔφυγον κακόν, εὗρον ἄμεινον, "I fled the bad, I found the better." But to revert from Christianity to Judaism was the worst kind of apostasy—it was to fling away the better from a deliberate preference for the worse.[1]

of this Epistle *metaphysical*." There is nothing in this Epistle so startling to the Jew as St. Paul's remark that the Law was given "for the sake of transgressions" (Gal. iii. 19); but what Apollos sees in the Law is mainly its *negative* relation to Christianity. The *Priesthood*, not the Law, is with him the essential thing, and as to the Law, he merely says that when there is a change in the one there must be a change in the other (vii. 12).

[1] Hence the constant recurrence of κρείττων ἐλπίς, κρείττων διαθήκη (vii. 19, 22); διαφορωτέρα λειτουργία (viii. 6); μείζων καὶ τελειοτέρα σκηνή (ix. 11); κρείττονες θυσίαι, ἐπαγγελίαι (ix. 23). It might almost be said that πόσῳ μᾶλλον, "how much more," is the key-note of the argument (ix. 14; x. 29)—the *argumentum a minori ad majus*.

The author (as we have seen) found his fruitful thought of a pre-existent Ideal in the Alexandrian philosophy. That philosophy had sprung up from seed which Plato had sown in the rich soil of Semitic monotheism. To the school of Philo, as to that of Plato, earth was—

> "But the shadow of Heaven, and things therein,
> Each to the other like more than on earth is thought." [1]

To them—and they found sanction for their views in Holy Writ—the world of *phenomena* was but the shadow of a world of *noumena*. The things seen and temporal were dim copies of things unseen and eternal. The visible universe is a faint adumbration of the archetypal, and it is only Divine in so far as it answers to the Great Idea of its Creator.

The Jews had begun to study Greek philosophy, and to see that—

> "All knowledge is not couched in Moses' Law,
> The Pentateuch, or what the Prophets wrote:
> The Gentiles also know, and write, and teach
> To admiration, led by Nature's light."

The spirit of Judaism had been kindled afresh by a breath of secular inspiration. They had begun to recognise in the nobler tones of heathen literature the voice of that eternal Sibyl who "in all ages entering into holy souls makes them sons of God and prophets, and speaking things simple and unperfumed and unadorned, reaches through ten thousand years by the aid of God."[2] Familiar with the *Timaeus*, Philo made his entire system depend on the existence of a Κόσμος

[1] "Der Sinnenwelt ein Schatte ist der Geistwelt" (Mahomed, a Persian poet, quoted by Tholuck, 135).

[2] Heraclitus.

νοητὸς, or World of Ideas, of which the Mosaic system was a *copy*. He learnt from Scripture that the worlds were made by the Word of God, and he regarded the ideal world as being the sum total of the concrete developments of this Infinite Logos. As St. John identifies the Logos with Christ, so the author of this Epistle identifies the Ideal World with the kingdom of Heaven, and the kingdom of Heaven with perfected salvation. And thus the conception—transplanted from the atmosphere of philosophy into that of religion—acquires new life. It is no longer a transcendental abstraction: it gives form and expression to a living hope.

We might, perhaps, suppose that there is a trace of the same conception in the language of St. Paul about "the heavenlies" in the Epistle to the Ephesians;[1] but St. Paul merely uses the expression as a moral appeal, and not as the basis of a theological system. In the Epistle before us the whole argument is made to turn upon it. Levitism is but a sketch in outline, a rough copy, a quivering shadow of the things in Heaven, which are supersensuous, invisible, immaterial, immovable, eternal.[2] This æon is but an imperfect realisation of the future æon.[3] The Tabernacle was made after the pattern of a Divine Temple,[4] and

[1] Eph. i. *passim*; and Heb. viii. 5; ix. 23.

[2] ὑπόδειγμα, viii. 5; σκίαν, ix. 1; ix. 23; xi. 1, 3; xii. 18, 27; παραβολὴ. ix. 9; ἀντίτυπα, ix. 24; as opposed to ὁ τύπος, or τὸ τέλειον, or τὰ ἀληθινὰ, or αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκών. The world of phenomena (αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις) is described as visible (τὸ βλεπόμενον, xi. 3), capable of being shaken (τὰ σαλευόμενα, xii. 27), tangible (xii. 18), but the archetypal world is the "House of God" (x. 21); "the genuine Tabernacle" (viii. 2); "the city which has the foundations" (xi. 10); our true "fatherland" (xi. 14); "the unshakeable kingdom" (xii. 28); "the heavenly Jerusalem" (xii. 22).

[3] Heb. ii. 5; vi. 5.

[4] Thus the Jews said that "An Ark of fire, and a Table and Lampstand of fire, came down from Heaven to Moses as patterns, and that

Christianity *is* that Temple. The superiority of Christianity to Judaism is shown to consist in this, that Judaism is earthy and sensuous, Christianity supersensuous and ideal. But the Christianity of this world is itself but a *closer* copy, a *truer* realisation of the perfect kingdom beyond the grave. Hence the kingdom of Heaven is both present and future. It is a salvation subjectively enjoyed, not yet objectively realised.[1]

(1.) From this different way of handling the relation of Christianity to Judaism, there arises incidentally a remarkable difference between the aspect presented by the Christian Hope in this writer and in St. Paul. St. Paul says, "We were saved by our Hope."[2] The salvation is secured, yet Hope is necessary, because here we groan in the mortal body. There is in us a "psychological dualism"—a disintegrated individuality—flesh struggling against spirit, and spirit against flesh, although the spirit is winning a progressive victory, and gradually asserting its sole pre-eminence. The Christian *receives* the Sonship, but he still awaits its perfect fruition.[3] He looks forward to the resurrection as his final deliverance from the assaults of the fleshly principle, after which he will be in possession of a spiritual body. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read nothing of this fierce struggle. Constantly as the author speaks of the future life, he says nothing about the Resurrection, except to mention it among the elementary subjects which he does not mean to discuss. But Hope is neces-

Gabriel, clothed as a workman, showed Moses how to make them.—(Menachoth, *f.* 29, 1.)

[1] Heb. xii. 28; vi. 4, 5.

[2] Rom. viii. 24: τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν.

[3] *Ib.* υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι.

sary, because the state in which we live is but a shadow of the state wherein we shall be. In this view we can only realise the future by exultant anticipation and inward evidence.[1] Hope is not fruition. Here the ship still tosses on the turbid waves, but yet it is held by a sure and steadfast anchor, of which the golden chain passes out of our sight in that aerial ocean beyond the veil;—and the unseen links of that chain are held by the hand of Christ, Who has gone before us there.[2] It remained for St. John to say and to show still more clearly and comfortingly that he that hath the Son *hath* life—that this *is* eternal life. In him Hope melts into actual fruition. The future becomes one with the present. The chasm between the two is bridged over by the highest utterance of revelation, that "the Word became flesh."

(2.) So far, then, we have seen that the Epistle to the Hebrews differs theologically from the writings of St. Paul by its marked Alexandrianism. But this is not the only difference. FAITH is prominent alike in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in St. Paul, but it is presented under a changed aspect. The terminology is in part identical, the accentuation of meaning is not the same. The writer uses St. Paul's phrases, but he applies them to truths seen under a different light. To St. Paul Faith meant the essence of the Christian life. Ultimately it meant the unity of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God—the life in Christ—the identity of the life of Christ with the life of the Christian. The life of faith in St. Paul is the realised immanence of Christianity, "Christ in me." This is the *form* of faith in his writings, and its *object* is the life, the death, the

[1] Heb. vi. 4, 5; xii. 28.
[2] Heb. vi. 19.

resurrection of his Lord. Now, often as faith is spoken of in this Epistle, the form and the object of it are different. Its *form* is "the substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things invisible."[1] The *object* of it is neither the Person of Christ,[2] nor the death of Christ,[3] nor the resurrection of Christ,[4] but it is trust in the word of God, and the entrance into that unseen world whereinto Christ has preceded us.[5] Not that the faith of this writer sinks into a Chiliastic expectation. It is the *present* approximation to future perfectness. It is confidence in the promised rest, founded on approach to God,[6]—analogous to the belief of the old heroes and Patriarchs, but more perfect and less distant,[7] and evinced by endurance.[8] Faith in St. Paul is oneness with Christ; in this writer it has Christ for its *example*. It is not the instrument of justification, but the condition of access. It is used in a sense more easily intelligible, and therefore more likely to be widely accepted. It is "Christ for us" rather than "Christ in us." Hence faith, as treated in this Epistle, becomes very closely allied with "endurance to the end."[9]

[1] xi. 1. On the meaning of ὑπόστασις and ἔλεγχος see *infra*, on Heb. xi. 1. "Der Begriff der πίστις ein anderer ist, nämlich nicht so wohl die *fides specialis in Christum* als die *fides generalis* in das unsichtbare (Ideale) Heil." Immer, *Neu-Test. Theol.* p. 403.

[2] Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4, etc.

[3] Rom. iii. 25; Gal. ii. 20.

[4] Eph. *passim*; 1 Cor. xv. etc. Christ's resurrection is only once alluded to by Apollos, Heb. xiii. 20, and that but passingly.

[5] vi. 1; xi. 1, 4, 2, etc. He does not speak of πίστις Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ or ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

[6] xi. 10.

[7] x. 34; xi. 40; xii. 22, 28.

[8] x. 35—39.

[9] xi. 1; xii. 1, τοιγάρουν . . . δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν.

So Philo defines Faith as "a bettering in all things of the soul which has cast itself for support on the Author of all things." *De Abrahamo*, ii. 39.

(2) *β*. There is a similar difference observable in the use of the word RIGHTEOUSNESS. St. Paul's use of the word is peculiar. The main dogmatic thesis of the Epistle to the Romans—"justification by faith"—is an illustration of the method whereby the subjective righteousness of God can become the objective righteousness (or justification) of man. To this dogma the letter before us does not allude, and *Dikaiosunê* is confined to its original meaning of simple "righteousness." For that state which St. Paul calls "justification" this writer has a different word. The words "imputed righteousness" nowhere occur in him. Righteousness with him is not a condition bestowed on man by God as a result of the work of Christ, but, as in James, it is faith manifested by obedience, and so earning the witness of God.[1] Thus the word *Dikaiosunê* is stripped of judicial accessories,[2] and the results of a life of obedience based on faith are expressed by the terms "purification," "sanctification," "perfectionment."[3] In other words, "righteousness" is not to this writer "the Divine gift which faith receives"—the white robe put into the outstretched hands; but it is "the human condition which faith produces,"[4] the inheritance which man acquires.[5]

Here, again, there is no contradiction of St. Paul, who carefully guards himself against Antinomian misconceptions, and who shows that where faith is there works must be, just as where sunlight is there warmth

[1] ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, xi. 4, 5.

[2] Δικαιόω occurs twenty-eight times in St. Paul; not once in this Epistle.

[3] ἁμάζειν, ἁγιάζεσθαι, ii. 11; x. 10, 14, 29; xiii. 12. Compare ῥαντίζειν, ῥαντισμός, x. 22, 29; xii. 24 (1 Pet. i. 2).

[4] xi. 33, διὰ πίστεως εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην.

[5] xi. 7. δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος. See Pfleiderer, ii. 86.

and light must be. But though there is no contradiction, there is marked divergence. The identity of phraseology does but serve to bring into prominence the underlying differences. Even when the author quotes the famous verse of Habakkuk, "The just shall live by faith," or, as he more probably wrote, "*My* just man shall live by faith," he applies it in a manner which is not the same as that of St. Paul. Each of the three words of the text has a different shade of meaning. By "the just" St. Paul means "he who has been justified;" by "faith" he means "union with Christ;" by "shall live" he means "enter into the spiritual life." The use of the text by Apollos comes nearer to its original significance in the old Jewish prophet, which was that "the upright man should be preserved from ruin by his fidelity."[1] How any careful reader with such facts before him can persist in maintaining that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, must remain one of the strangest problems of theological criticism.

(3.) Once more, without the smallest *contradiction* between the CHRISTOLOGY of St. Paul and that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we can trace in the latter the speciality of Alexandrian influences. The conception of the Eternal Christ, as One Who was far above all angels, is the same as in the Epistle to the Colossians, but the expressions used of Him are even stronger. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is not only the Image of God, as He is in St. Paul,[2] but also, as in

[1] Hab. ii. 4; Rom. i. 17; Heb. x. 38. See my *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 181; Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*. ii. 89; Weiss, *Petrin. Lehrbegr.* 527.
[2] εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, Col. i. 15; iii. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

the Book of Wisdom,[1] "the effulgence of His glory, and the impress of His substance;" and is not only, as in St. Paul, the Instrument of creation, but also the upholder of all things by the word of His power. In this respect Apollos stands midway between St. Paul and St. John. The word *Logos*, as directly applied to Christ, seems constantly to be in his mind, but he does not actually use it. And yet in his first chapter,[2] and elsewhere,[3] he transfers directly to Christ the attributes of the Logos of Philo.[4] And by so doing he produced a deep effect. In the Apocalypse, also, Christ appears as the Logos and the High Priest. In its exalted conception of our Lord's Divinity, and in the development of His high-priestly functions,[5] the Epistle to the Hebrews exercised an influence upon the Church which perpetuated its value long after any proof of the superiority of Christianity to Judaism had been rendered needless by the inexorable demonstrations of History.

(4.) And the REDEMPTIVE WORK of Christ is also

[1] Wisd. vii. 25, 26. Noack suggested an ingenious theory, that the Book of Wisdom was written by Apollos before his conversion. This theory has been worked out by Dean Plumptre in the *Expositor*, i. 327, 348, 409—435. He adduces the words common to Wisdom and the Epistle, such as πολυμερῶς, ἀπαύγασμα, ὑπόστασις, θεράπων, τόπος μετανοίας, βεβαίωσις, ἔκβασις, and many more; shows the connexion of both books with Philo; points to parallel passages like Heb. iv. 12 and Wisd. xviii. 22; shows that Clemens of Rome used both books; illustrates the sonorous style of both, the fondness for compounds, for unusual words, and for an accumulation of epithets; and calls attention to the fact that the two books are mentioned in juxtaposition by Irenæus (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 26), and nearly so in the Muratorian Canon.

[2] Heb. i. 1—4.

[3] iv. 12. 13.

[4] *De Somn.* (Mang. i. 633, τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραδεῖγμα ὁ πληρέστατος ἦν ἀυτοῦ Λόγος φῶς.)

[5] It is reproduced in Clem. Rom. *ad Rom.* 36, 58, and referred to in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

looked at from a slightly different standpoint, both in its nature and its results. In St. Paul the decree of God and the passivity of Christ are mainly dwelt upon, and His death is regarded from its most mysterious aspect as being an expiatory sacrifice to redeem mankind from the curse of the Law; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is not only the passive victim, but the sacrificing priest.[1] The result of His willing sacrifice of Himself is the purification of man's conscience from the sense of guilt,[2] and the sanctification of man's life by a new relation towards God. Guilt had rendered us impure before God. The Jews of old were replaced in a condition of Levitical purity, partly by sacrifices, partly by a sprinkling of blood. We are rendered spiritually pure from the defilement of a tormenting conscience by the death of Christ for us once for all, and by the sprinkling of our consciences with His Blood. The point of view from which Christ's death is here regarded is not the identity of the Christian with Christ, but the passing through the veil into the Holiest,—the approach to Christ, and through Christ to God. Even when he is dwelling directly on the death of Christ, the author scarcely ever uses any phrase which can be interpreted as intimating that it was an expiation which was necessary to manifest that God was righteous although He forgave sin.[3] The reason which he assigns for the abstract

[1] Geiger has argued that this conception came from the Sadducees, and therefore that the writer must have once been a Sadducee. There is nothing to be said in favour of this view, and much against it. See Matt. xxii. 23, and Acts xxiii. 8, compared with Heb. vi. 2; xi. 35; i. ii. *passim*.

[2] The two words most frequently used are καθαρισμός, καθαρίζειν, as in ix. 13, 14; x. 2, 22, &c.; and ἁγιάζειν, ii. 11; x. 10.

[3] As in Rom. iii. 25; Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21.

necessity of Christ's death is that a testament can only come into force after the death of the testator.[1] This reason, taken alone, explains so small a part of the matter, and so completely leaves out of sight the *sacrificial* death of Christ, and bears so slightly on the analogy of the ancient sacrifices on which he has so long been dwelling, that we are almost driven to infer that the writer supposed his readers to be aware of the explanation of this mystery furnished by St. Paul, and therefore deemed it needless to develop it further. This is the more remarkable, because whereas the author speaks even more strongly than St. Paul of the majesty of the Eternal and Pre-existent Christ, he yet dwells more distinctly than St. Paul on the moral and human side of the life of Christ—His prayers and tears, His anguish, His holy fear, His perfectionment through suffering.[2] He contents himself with the general expression that there was a moral fitness in its being thus ordained.[3] But while we can have no doubt that he accepted the truth which St. Paul had taught,[4] we can see how natural it was for one who had been trained in Alexandrian notions to accept it without being led to dwell upon it; to leave it as an insoluble mystery; to feel a difficulty in speaking of "reconciliation," or of any apparent

[1] Heb. ix. 15—22.

[2] ii. 10; iv. 15; v. 8; vi. 20; vii. 2, 10; xii. 2.

[3] *ἔπρεπεν ἡμῖν*, vii. 26.

[4] That he does so is clear from such expressions as *ἀπολύτρωσις*, ix. 15; *αἱματεκχυσία*, ix. 22; *ἱλάσκεσθαι*, ii. 17; *ὅπως ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου*, ii. 9. But these expressions make it only the more remarkable that he nowhere touches on the *reason* for these necessities—the rationale of this reconciliation. He says that Christ was offered and man was cleansed, but he nowhere develops any theory of vicarious satisfaction to explain the fact. (Köstlin, *Johann. Lehrbegr.* 435.)

contrast between God's retributive wrath and His reconciling love. That which only *could* be expressed in anthropomorphic, and therefore in imperfect metaphors, was least calculated to attract the genius of Alexandrian elucidation. We are not surprised that an Alexandrian should reverently leave this on one side, as being the mysterious element in Christ's sacrifice which is to us incomprehensible. He does not, therefore, touch on the satisfaction of God's justice, but on another aspect of Christ's death—namely, the annihilation of the power of the devil.[1] He is content to declare, without further discussion, that Christ's death is man's purification. He "leaves a gap between the means and the end."[2] He dwells more on Christ the Sanctifier than on God the Justifier.[3] He speaks of Christ's sufferings as the appointed pathway of His perfection, and of the following of His example as the appointed means of our being perfected.[4] Scarcely touching on St.

[1] Compare Col. ii. 14, 15. Both writers use the word "ransom," because *as regards man* Christ's death has the effect of a ransom paid. But neither of them touch on the question, "*To whom* is the ransom paid?" And with good reason: because that question is an invasion of the secrets of the Deity. When men insist on trying to answer it, they (1) either draw out a doctrine of the Atonement which represents God in a light which utterly shocks the moral sense, or (2) infer, as was taught by theologians for a thousand years, that the person to whom the ransom was paid was—the Devil! Such a notion would have been abhorrent to the Alexandrian monotheism; and that the notion of a "warfare or lawsuit" between Christ and Satan should for so many hundred years have formed a constant element of Church teaching respecting the mystery of the Atonement, from Augustine to Anselm, is one of the many historic facts which should abate the towering pretensions of an inferential theology.

[2] x. 14.

[3] See Davidson, *Introd.* ii. 245.

[4] ii. 9, 10; xii. 6—11; v. 9; τελείωσις, "perfectionment," is a characteristic word of this Epistle, and it seems to include both "justification," "sanctification," and "glorification."

Paul's words "ransom," "reconciliation," "justification," he teaches that Christ, by His suffering and death, performed once for all the work of an Eternal High Priest—offered that sacrifice of Himself which purges the consciousness of man from its sense of guilt, and, as our forerunner and standard-bearer, flung open the heavenly sanctuary, the archetypal world, wherein man, purified from guilt, can enter into the Presence of God—in hope and humble access now, in beatific vision hereafter behind the veil.[1]

(5.) In seizing upon PRIESTHOOD and SACRIFICE, rather than on the Law, as the central point of his treatment, the writer showed his deep knowledge of Jewish feeling. Not only do the regulations respecting worship occupy the greater part of the Book of Leviticus, but, as we shall see further, the imagination of the people had almost concentrated itself upon priestly functions, and especially upon the Great Day of Atonement. A glance at the Talmud will show how large a part Priesthood occupied in the thoughts of every Jew. Thus we are told of the Priests that their descent from Aaron was the badge of exclusive privilege;[2] that in the faithful days of the first Temple each High-priest enjoyed

[1] vi. 20; x. 20. It will be seen, then, that points in which the writer is not distinctively Pauline are, (1) the prominence of τελείωσις rather than of δικαίωσις; (2) the conception of Christ less as the Crucified and Risen than as the sympathetic High Priest; (3) the conception of approach to Him (προσέρχεσθαι πρός) rather than of mystic union with Him (Immer, *Neu Test. Theol.* p. 403). (4) St. Paul's quotations are introduced by γέγραπται γὰρ or καθὼς γέγραπται, etc. (Rom. xv. 21; 1 Cor. ii. 9; Gal. iii. 10, iv. 22, etc.), those of this Epistle by other formulæ, as "the Holy Ghost saith," or "witnesseth," etc. (see iii. 7; ii. 6; vii. 17; x. 15, etc.). (5) He holds more closely to the LXX. and the readings now found in *Cod. Alexandrinus*, whereas St. Paul follows those now found in *Cod. Vaticanus* (Bleek).

[2] Berachoth, f. 29, *a.*]

an average of 23 years of office;[1] that when he was admitted to service he was inspected by the Sanhedrin, and if there was so much as a mole on his body he was dressed in black and dismissed;[2] that even if priests were unworthy, no one was to think evil of them;[3] that if a priest was found to be Levitically unclean while performing the Temple service, his juniors might at once drag him out of the Temple and brain him with clubs.[4] The very garments of the priests were not only used to make wicks for the great candlestick,[5] but were regarded as so holy that they had the faculty of atoning for sin—the tunic for murder, the ephod for idolatry, the girdle for evil thoughts.[6] One passage will still further show their estimation: "So long," says the tract Gittin,[7] commenting on Ezek. xxi. 26, "as there is a diadem on the head of a priest, there is a crown on the head of every man. Remove the diadem from the head of the high-priest, and you take away the crown from the head of all the people."

(6.) There is yet another point on which we may seize as marking the difference between the writer and St. Paul. It is perhaps an accident that he uses a phrase—"to Him *that made Him*" (iii. 2)[8]—which, though capable of perfectly simple explanation, yet lent itself with so much facility to the misinterpretations of heresy that it acted as one of the causes which delayed the general acceptance of the Epistle by the Church. But it is no accident that the writer in three passages

[1] Yoma, f. 9, *a*.
[2] Yoma, f. 19, *a*.
[3] Kiddushin, f. 70, *b*.
[4] Sanhedrin, f. 81, *b*.
[5] Shabbath, f. 21, *a*.
[6] Zevachim, f. 88, *b*.
[7] Fol. 7, *a*. These and other passages are quoted in Mr. Hershon's *Talmudic Miscellany*, p. 107.
[8] See the note on this passage.

(vi. 4—8; x. 26—31; xii. 16, 17) uses language of such unconditional sternness that it was seized upon with avidity by those who held the uncompromising tenets of the Montanists and Novatians. No such passages are to be found in St. Paul's Epistles. The fulness of almost universal hope which marks the outbursts of emotional eloquence in his epistles, shows that such language could hardly have been used by him without large qualification. It is true, as I have shown in dealing with those passages, that they lend no real sanction to the conclusions which have been built upon them; and that, if they did, they would stand in flagrant contradiction to other passages of Scripture. I believe that the real thoughts of the writer would have coincided with those of St. Paul; but the use of language which lends itself to perversion with so much facility is yet another mark that his idiosyncrasy differs from that of the great Apostle.

If, then, there be these marked differences between the aspect of the same great Christian verities as viewed from the standpoint of St. Paul's individuality and that of the writer of this Epistle, it is idle to pretend any longer that St. Paul was the author. The differences are there. No one can any longer overlook them. And if the differences are there, it is clear that the ancient guesses about an amanuensis who used the thoughts of St. Paul, but expressed them in his own language, fall to the ground.[1] We are, therefore, studying the work of another writer of the Apostolic age, who thought for himself, and who wrote in

[1] Schwegler supposes that the writer tried to pass for Paul (*Nachap. Zeit.* ii. 304), and was amply refuted by Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 420; 1854, p. 437.

his own manner. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit was not a mechanical dictation, which makes a man the pen rather than the penman of sacred utterance, and obliterates the plainest landmarks of human idiosyncrasy. It is a positive gain to us that we have here the treatise of a great follower of the Pauline school of thought—a school which was so completely overshadowed by the mighty genius of the Apostle of the Gentiles that it scarcely produced a single other writer of remarkable eminence.[1]

[1] The notion of Hase, that the Epistle is by a Nazarene heretic and addressed to Nazarenes, though partially favoured by Ritschl (*Altkathol. Kirche* (second edition), p. 159), needs no further notice (see Hilgenfeld, *Einleit.* 359). Every sober enquirer now acquiesces in the opinion that the Epistle represents Pauline views, but coloured by Alexandrian influences, and leaning to the Jewish-Christian standpoint, so far as this was possible to any follower of St. Paul. (See Baur, *Three Christian Cent.* i. 115, seqq.).

CHAPTER XVII.

WHO WROTE THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS?

"Auctor Epistolae ad Hebraeos quisquis est, sive Paulus sive *ut ego arbitror* APOLLO."—LUTHER, *ad Gen.* xlviii. 20.

"Quis porro eam composuerit non magnopere curandum est. . . . Sed ipsa dicendi ratio et stilus alium quam Paulum esse satis testantur."—CALVIN.

IF the author—and by author I do not mean merely the amanuensis, but the actual originator of this Epistle—were not St. Paul, who was it? I have already indicated my belief that it was Apollos, and it is now necessary to furnish the grounds, both positive and negative, for that all but certain conclusion.

The author does not adopt the invariable practice of St. Paul by beginning his Epistle with a greeting in his own name, although it is clear that he meant his readers to know, both from the Epistle itself and through the bearer of it, who he was; nor is his treatise full of that rich element of personality which lends to St. Paul's Epistles so indefinable a charm. But yet, from the Epistle itself we see certain broad facts.

(1.) The writer was a Jew, for he writes as though Heathendom were practically non-existent.

(2.) He was a Hellenist, for he exclusively quotes the Septuagint version, even where it diverges from the original Hebrew.[1]

[1] In one remarkable passage (x. 30) he follows St. Paul (Rom. xii. 19) in a variant quotation of Deut. xxxii. 35.

(3.) He had been subjected to Alexandrian training, for he shows a deep impress of Alexandrian thought, and quotes from Alexandrian manuscripts of the Septuagint, without pausing to question the accuracy of the renderings.[1]

(4.) He was a man of great eloquence, of marked originality, of wide knowledge of the Scriptures, and of remarkable gifts in the application of Scripture arguments.

(5.) He was a friend of Timotheus, for he proposes to visit the Jewish Churches in his company.

(6.) He was known to his readers, and writes to them in a tone of authority.

(7.) He was not an Apostle, for he classes himself with those who had been taught by the Apostles.[2]

(8.) The Apostle by whom he had been taught was St. Paul, for he largely, though independently, adopts his phraseology, and makes special use of the Epistle to the Romans.[3]

(9.) He wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem, and while the Temple services were still continuing.

(10.) It is doubtful whether he had ever been at Jerusalem, for his references to the Temple and its ritual seem to apply, not, indeed, to the Temple of

[1] See Bleek, i. 357; Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853.

[2] Heb. ii. 3. Any one who chooses to explain away the obvious meaning of this verse in the interests of the Pauline authorship, by talking of "*anakoinosis*" or "*sunkatabasis*," must do so. But those technical words are here inapplicable, and the supposed parallels too illusory to need refutation. Serious readers will see how impossible it is that such a phrase should have been used (and that to Jewish readers!) by one who had written such passages as Gal. i. 1, 12; 2 Cor. xi. 2—4; xii. 12; Eph. iii. 2, 3, &c.

[3] *V. infra*, p. 344.

Onias, at Leontopolis,[1] but mainly to the Tabernacle as described in the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch.

Further than this we have no data[2] on which to decide the question of his identity; but we may fairly assume that we should find in the New Testament the name of any friend and companion of St. Paul of sufficient authority, learning, and genius to have been the author of so remarkable an Epistle. Now, the only known companions of St. Paul who would in any way fall under this description were Aquila, Silas, Titus, Barnabas, Clemens, Mark, Luke, and Apollos,[3] and accordingly several of these were conjecturally designated as the authors, or part authors, in ancient days. Assuming, as we are entitled to do, that it was one of these, the only way to decide between them will be by a process of elimination.

The claims of some of them may be dismissed at once.

1. AQUILA, for instance, could not have been the author; for the fact that he is constantly mentioned with his wife, and even after her, shows that his personality must have been somewhat insignificant,[4] and that his wife was superior to him in energy.

2. TITUS could not have been the author, for he was a Gentile.

[1] See Wieseler, *Untersuchung über d. Hebr.* A great deal too much has been made of the suggestion. Philo only recognised *one* πατρῷον ἱερόν, and the Jews of Egypt never dreamt of looking on the Temple of Onias in the same light as the Samaritans looked on Mount Gerizim, namely, as a rival shrine to the one Temple, to which they sent their yearly offerings. The conjecture of Wieseler ought, therefore, to be finally dismissed. See the decisive remarks of Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iii. 31—34, 412.

[2] The allusion in x. 34 has no bearing on the authorship.

[3] Timotheus is, of course, excluded by xiii. 23.

[4] Acts xviii. 18; Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19.

3. There is nothing to be said in favour of the authorship of SILAS,[1] especially as he seems to have been not a Hellenist, but a Jew of Jerusalem.

4. Tertullian, in his usual oracular way, attributes the Epistle to BARNABAS, but he seems to have done so by an unsupported conjecture.[2] The Epistle is incomparably superior to the Epistle of Barnabas, with its exaggerated Paulinism; but that Epistle is not by the Barnabas of the New Testament, and is not earlier in date than A.D. 110.[3] The "Apostle" Barnabas, as a Levite, would more probably have described the Temple at Jerusalem *as it then was*, and if he had possessed the natural ability to compose such a treatise as this, he would not have been so immediately thrown into the shade by St. Paul from the very beginning of his first missionary journey.[4]

[1] Only held by Böhme and Mynster. The former supposed that the Greek of 1 Peter was also by Silvanus, and that it resembled the Greek of this epistle.

[2] Tert. *De pudicit.* 20: "Exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos." Perhaps he had heard of an "Epistle of Barnabas," and confused this letter with it. The claims of Barnabas are maintained by Camerarius, Twesten, Ullmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 828), Thiersch (*Comment. Hist. de Ep. ad Hebr.* 1847)—who, however, thinks that the Epilogue was by St. Paul,—and Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 504, and *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief*, 1861). Wieseler speaks of Tertullian's assertion as the only authentic tradition on the subject. His arguments about the position of the Epistle in the Peshito, etc., seem to me to be very inconclusive. Thiersch supposes that the Epilogue may have been written by St. Paul, and so too Delitzsch (arguing from xiii. 8). Renan also inclines in favour of Barnabas (*L'Antéchrist*, p. xvii.). In the Clementine Homilies (i. 9), Barnabas (and not St. Mark) appears as the founder of the Church of Alexandria.

[3] See Harnack, in Herzog, *s. v.* Barnabas, and the article by Heberle in the old edition. Hefele also (*Patr. Apost.*) has shown how impossible it would have been for the *Apostle* Barnabas to see in the Jewish ceremonies mere foolish carnal mistakes about things which God had intended to be understood spiritually.

[4] Bp. Wordsworth (*Introd.* p. 362) adds that Epiphanius, as a Cyprian Bishop, might have been supposed to know the work of a fellow-Cypriot.

His claims have received but little support, and he would have been indeed unfortunate if a false Epistle was attributed to him, and his real Epistle, which was so far superior, assigned to another.

5. St. Clemens's claims, though mentioned by several of the Fathers,[1] may be set aside, because we have one genuine Epistle from his hands, and—independently of differences of view—that letter is sufficient to show that he had not the capacity to write the Epistle to the Hebrews. Besides this he quotes from the Epistle to the Hebrews as though it were of coordinate authority to the rest of Holy Scripture, which he certainly could not have done in the case of any writing of his own.[2]

6. St. Mark has never been seriously suggested as the possible author, because his Gospel presents no points of analogy to this Epistle either in style or sentiment. Further than this, it is probable that he also was a Jew of Jerusalem, and his connexion with St. Peter was closer and more permanent than his connexion with St. Paul.

7. St. Luke, though often suggested as the *scribe* of the letter[3]—on the hypothesis that the *thoughts* came directly from St. Paul—could not possibly

[1] *E.g.*, Origen (*v. infra*, Excurs. IX.), Euthalius, Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 18), and Jerome. The view is accepted as probable by Erasmus and Calvin. Almost the only modern writer who maintains this view is Riethmayer (*Einleit.* p. 681).

[2] It is strange that Euthalius (A.D. 460) should say τοῦ γὰρ καὶ σώζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα, though it is true enough that many of the sentiments resemble each other (μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι, Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 38). But the resemblance is merely due to direct plagiarism, while the difference in strength and originality is immeasurable.

[3] Clemens Alex., Origen, Grotius, Hug, Stier, Guerike, F. Delitzsch, Ebrard, Bisping, Wieseler, Renan.

have been the author. It is true that in the Gospel and the Acts we frequently find words and idioms which occur in this Epistle.[1] That is a phenomenon which is not difficult to explain in the case of two writers who had passed through the same kind of training, and had lived, perhaps, in each other's company, and certainly in close contact with the mind and teaching of St. Paul. But in spite of these resemblances the style and the tone of the Epistle to the Hebrews differ essentially from those of St. Luke. Balanced rhetoric and majestic periods are nowhere found in the writings of the Evangelist, and it is psychologically difficult to believe that a writer whose prevailing tone of mind was tender and conciliatory should have written passages of such uncompromising sternness as those which occur in Hebrews vi. 4—8; x. 26; xii. 27. In these passages the sternest Montanists exulted, and they were used as bulwarks of the Novatians in their refusal to re-admit the lapsed to Baptism or the Lord's Supper; but they have always raised a difficulty in the minds of those who reject the ruthless dogma that there is no forgiveness for post-baptismal sin.[2] Apart from these considerations, it appears to be

[1] Clemens Alex. observes on the general resemblance of style (*τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα*) between the Epistle and the Acts. The parallels are tabulated by Lünemann in his edition of the Epistle, and are constantly referred to by Delitzsch and Ebrard. Among them are *εὐλαβεῖσθαι, εἰς τὸ παντελές, ἡγούμενος, ἀρχηγός* (used of Christ, Acts iii. 15; v. 31; Heb. ii. 10; xii. 2), *μαρτυρούμενος, παροξυσμός, μέτοχος*. They are, however, of no decisive importance. See Riehm, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 886, note. Moreover, St. Luke more closely followed St. Paul's theological views and expressions (*ἡ εἰς Χριστὸν πίστις, δικαιοῦσθαι ἐξ Ἰησοῦ*, etc., Acts xiii. 39; Lk. xviii. 14) than this writer does. See *supra*, cap. xvi.

[2] Even the Novatians did not exclude the hope that God would forgive post-baptismal sins. Acesius, a Novatian Bishop, said that "those who had sinned a sin unto death" could not be indeed admitted to the Christian

almost certain that St. Luke was a Gentile Christian,[1] and there is much ground for the tradition which describes him as a Proselyte of Antioch. He could not, therefore, have written this Epistle. It may be regarded as an axiom that it could not have been written by any one of Gentile birth.

8. If, then, the writer was neither St. Paul nor any of these, we are led by the exhaustive process to consider the claims of Apollos, and we at once find not only that none of those objections can be urged against him which are fatal to the claims of the others, but also that he meets in every one of the ten particulars the requirements of the problem. He was a Jew; he was a Hellenist; he was an Alexandrian; he was a friend of St. Paul and had been deeply influenced by his teaching; he could not have been specially familiar with the Temple ritual; he was remarkable for originality; he was an attractive orator; he was a powerful reasoner; he was a man of great personal authority; he taught with so much independence, that St. Paul formally recognised his gift of maturing and preserving the germs of truth which he himself had sown.[2] Had St. Paul and St. Luke deliberately designed to point out a man capable of writing the Epistle to the Hebrews, they could not have chosen any words more suitable to such an object than those by which they actually describe him as a Jew, an Alexandrian by birth, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures,

mysteries, ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως . . . παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι (at the Council of Nice; Socr. *H. E.* i. 10).

[1] Col. iv. 11—15. See my *Life of St. Paul*, i. 480.

[2] Some of these peculiarities in the mind and manner of Apollos are illustrated by the allusions to the partisans who used his name in Corinth (1 Cor. iii.).

fervent in spirit, who, after having been carefully taught the way of the Lord, "began to teach accurately the things concerning the Lord," and powerfully confuted the Jews out of the Scriptures.[1] Even in minor matters we trace the same congruence between Apollos and the writer of this Epistle. We are told that he was originally acquainted only with the baptism of John, and this writer places the "doctrine of baptisms" among the rudiments of Christian teaching.[2] We are told that "he began to speak with confident boldness in the Synagogue," and this writer has a high estimate of confident boldness as a virtue which the Christian should always retain.[3] Lastly, we see in Apollos the rare combination of a dislike of prominence with a remarkable power of oratory. This is exemplified in his refusal of the invitation of the Corinthians, some of whom so greatly admired his culture and oratory that they preferred his teaching even to that of St. Paul. In that generous refusal he displayed the very feeling which would have induced him to suppress all personal references, even when his readers were perfectly well acquainted with the name and antecedents of him who was addressing them.

It is stated as an insuperable objection to this theory that the Church of Alexandria retained no tradition that this Epistle was written by their brilliant fellow-countryman. But although Apollos was an Alexandrian by birth and by training, it does not follow that he had lived in his native city,[4] and as he

[1] Acts xviii. 24—28, xix. 1; 1 Cor. iii. 4—6.

[2] Acts xviii. 26; Heb. vi. 2.

[3] παῤῥησιάζεσθαι, Acts xviii. 26; τὴν παῤῥησίαν, x. 35; iii. 6.

[4] The reading of D (the *Codex Bezae*) in Acts xviii. 24 (ἐν τῇ πατρίδι) may be a mere conjecture.

had left the city before he became a Christian, he may have been a stranger to the Alexandrian Christians. We do not hear a word about the Epistle in that Church until a century after it was written. At any rate, this difficulty is not so great as that which arises from the supposition that the Epistle was the work of St. Paul, and yet was not recognised as such for some centuries by the Western Church, and only partially and hesitatingly by the Eastern Church.[1] For there would be every temptation to attribute the work to the Apostle, and none to associate it with the name of Apollos, which, except in one or two Churches, seems to have been but little known.[2]

It is not a decisive objection to the Apollonian authorship that no one is known to have suggested it before Luther. We have seen that in the early centuries the Epistle was only assigned to this or that author by a process of tentative guesswork. Those who saw that St. Paul could not have been the actual author often adopted one of the arbitrary hypotheses, that it is a translation, or that the sentiments and the language were supplied by different persons. The self-suppression of Apollos resulted in the comparative obscurity of his work, and the Fathers, having nothing but conjecture to deal with, fixed upon names

[1] The last paragraphs are more in the style of St. Paul than any of the rest; and even in modern times this has led Thiersch and others into the opinion that, though the body of the Epistle was not written by him, yet he adopted it as his own, and wrote the last chapter with his own hand The suggestion is untenable, but the superficial grounds on which it rests were sufficient to lead many, in uncritical days, to assume that the whole Epistle was written by the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

[2] The passages on which we can alone depend for our knowledge of Apollos are Acts xviii. 24—28; 1 Cor. iii. 4—6; xvi. 12 (comp. Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19); Tit. iii. 13.

every one of which was more generally familiar than that of the eloquent Alexandrian. And if it be strange that the name of Apollos should not have been preserved by the Church to which the letter was despatched, we may account for this by the absence of superscription, and by the fact that it was only addressed to the Jewish section of that Church. This much may be said with certainty, that if it were not written by Apollos, at any rate the evidence which points to him as its author is more various and more conclusive than that which can be adduced to support the claims of any one else. It is a greater testimony in his favour that his name, when once suggested by a flash of happy intuition, should have been accepted, with more or less confidence, by an ever-increasing number of trained and careful critics of all schools,[1] than that it should not have occurred to the less laborious and penetrating examination of writers in the early centuries. To suppose that even an Origen or a Jerome—much less an Augustine—subjected the Epistle to that minute comparative study, word by word and line by line, which it has since received from writers like Bleek and Tholuck, and in its theological aspect from Delitzsch, Riehm, Ebrard, Reuss, and Pfleiderer, is to ignore facts. The decision of the future will be that it was either written by Apollos or by some writer who is to us entirely unknown.

As to the date of the Epistle, our only clue is fur-

[1] Luther, Osiander, Le Clerc, Heumann, L. Müller, Semler, Ziegler, Dindorf, Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Rothe, Feilmoser, Lutterbeck, Guerike, De Wette, Lünemann, Alford, Kurz, Davidson, Plumptre, Moulton. A few writers—*e.g.*, R. Köstlin, Moll, Ewald, Riehm—think that the name of the author is undiscoverable.

nished by the certainty that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and by the allusion to the liberation of Timotheus.[1] Had it been written after the fall of Jerusalem, the arguments of the writer might have been stated with tenfold force. The author of the Epistle of Barnabas, for instance (4, 16) is able to treat very differently a similar line of reasoning. The destruction of Jerusalem came like a Divine comment on all the truths which are here set forth. It is no answer to this difficulty that Josephus,[2] the Mishna, the Gemara, the Epistles of Barnabas,[3] and Clemens,[4] and Justin Martyr[5] continue to speak of the Temple worship in the present tense after the City and Temple had been destroyed.[6] In the Epistle to the Hebrews we are dealing not with a figure of speech,[7] but with the structure of an argument. A writer who could argue as in Heb. x. 2, without adding the tremendous corroboration which his views had received from the Divine sanction of History, could not have written the Epistle at all.

The allusion to Timothy is too vague to admit of any certain conclusion being founded upon it. It is probable that Timothy obeyed the summons to come immediately to Rome which he had received from St. Paul,[8] and that in the then exacer-

1 Heb. xiii. 23.

2 Jos. *Antt.* vii. 6, §§ 7—12; *c. Apion*, i. 7; ii. 8, 23.

3 *Ep. Barnab.* 7.

4 Clemens Rom. i. 40.

5 *Dial. c. Tryph.* 107.

6 This argument is used by Keim (*Jesu von Nazara*, i. 148, 636), who, with Volkmar (*Rel. Jesu*, 388) and Holtzmann (in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*), tries to bring down the date of the Epistle to the persecution of Domitian.

7 See Hilgenfeld, *Einleit.* 381.

8 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21

bation of the imperial government against the Christians he so far shared in the peril of the great Apostle as to have been thrown into a prison. He may have been subsequently set free because of the harmlessness of his character and the lack of evidence against him. If so, this Epistle must have been written soon after the year of St. Paul's death, at the end of A.D. 67, or the beginning of A.D. 68. This date suits well with the allusions which indicate that the first generation of Christians had already passed, or was rapidly passing, away.

It was addressed to Jewish Christians exclusively—to Jews by birth, who, though they had been converted,[1] were in imminent danger of apostasy, and who had been subjected to persecution, which was not, however, so severe as to have led to many martyrdoms.[2] If we could assume that the last four verses were a special postscript to some particular Church, it might be supposed that the letter was rather intended as a treatise in which Jews were addressed in the abstract[3]; but even then it must have been sent in the first instance to at least one Church.

[1] Heb. ii. 3, 4; iv. 14; v. 11; vi. 1; viii. 1; x. 19, &c. Comp. Acts vi. 1. Hase supposes that it was addressed to a group of Palestinian Nazarites; Stuart, that it was written by St. Paul to Cæsarea; Boehme, that it was sent to Antioch.

[2] Wieseler (*Untersuchung*, ii. 3, *seq.*) has conclusively proved that the term "Hebrews" need not be confined to Palestinian Jews. (See 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5.) Josephus originally wrote his "Jewish War" in Aramaic, yet he tells us it was meant for Jews all over Asia (see Tholuck, *Hebr.* p. 97). Moreover, it is far from certain that the superscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους is genuine. From the Muratorian Canon we might suppose that in another inscription it was called "to the Alexandrians."

[3] So Euthalius thought: πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύσασιν Ἑβραίοις. Delitzsch is therefore mistaken when he says that it was the *unanimous* ancient opinion that it was addressed to Judæa.

i. That this was not the Church of Jerusalem[1] is all but certain. It is true that the Mother Church might have been specially interested by all that the writer says; but the saints of Jerusalem would have been hardly likely to welcome a letter from a Hellenist, which only quoted from the Septuagint, and which was written in Greek. Moreover, it cannot be said of them, in any ordinary sense, that "they had not yet resisted unto blood;" nor were they in a position to minister to the saints,[2] being themselves overwhelmed in the deepest poverty; nor would it be likely that no allusion should have been made to the fact that some of them must have actually heard the words and witnessed the sufferings of Christ; nor would any of St. Paul's companions have been entitled to address them in the tone of authority which the writer adopts; nor were the Christians of Palestine specially interested in Timothy. A Paulinist in the position of Apollos could not have ventured to reproach the Church of the earliest saints in such words of severe and authoritative rebuke for their ignorance and childishness as occur in Heb. v. 11—14. This passage is alone sufficient to show the unlikelihood that the "Hebrews" addressed are the Palestinian Christians.[3]

ii. Corinth, which would otherwise be naturally

[1] ποῦ δὲ οὖσιν ἐπέστελλεν; ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ, Chrysost. *Prooem. in Hebr.*; and so, too, Theodoret. This is the view of Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Thiersch, Delitzsch, Lünemann, Riehm, Ebrard, Lange: but the notion is being gradually abandoned. It sprang from the Greek Fathers, and it is a mistake to suppose that it is necessitated by the title "the saints" (1 Cor. vi. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; viii. 4, &c.).

[2] Heb. vi. 10.

[3] Ebrard supposes that it was meant for Christian neophytes at Jerusalem, who were rendered anxious by being excluded from the Temple-worship.

conjectured, is excluded by the allusion (ii. 3) which points to a Church founded by one of the original Twelve Apostles.

iii. ALEXANDRIA[1] would have seemed probable, and has in its favour the dubious allusion of the Muratorian Canon; but Timothy had no relations with Alexandria, and (which is a far more serious objection) it is unlikely that a Church like that of Alexandria would have forgotten the authorship of a letter by one of their own countrymen, if it had been in the first instance addressed to them.[2]

iv. If our conjecture about Timothy's imprisonment be correct, it could not have been addressed to ROME, which otherwise has many considerations in its favour.[3] It was well known to St. Clemens of Rome, and some of the allusions of the Epistle might suit the Neronian persecution. On the other hand, the tortures spoken of are somewhat distant in time (τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, x. 32), and the Roman Church more than any other *had* resisted unto blood.[4] We have no hint in the New Testament

[1] Heb. ii. 3. See Dean Plumptre's argument in the *Expositor*, i. 428—432, that it is addressed to Christian ascetics connected with Alexandria. The notion that it was addressed to Alexandria is adopted by Schmidt, Reuss, Credner, Volkmar, Köstlin, Bunsen (*Hippolytus*, i. 365), Hilgenfeld, Ullmann, Schleiermacher, and Wieseler (*Chron.* 496).

[2] Schleiermacher, *Einleit.* 445; Ad. Maier, *Hebr.* 4. If ἐν τῇ πατρίδι, the reading of D in Acts xviii. 25, is correct, Apollos had been converted in Alexandria. Hilgenfeld (*Einleit.* 357) gets over the difficulty by supposing that it may have been addressed as a *private* letter to one *section* of the Church.

[3] It was suggested by Wetstein (*N. T.* ii. 386), and supported at length by Holzmann (Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, viii. 432; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1859), Kurtz, Renan, and Alford (*Introd. to Hebrews*). It is the view of Eichhorn, Schulz, Baur, Holtzmann, &c. Ewald thinks it may have been written to —Ravenna! Wilibald Grimm fixes on Jamnia; Hofmann on the Jewish section of the Church at Antioch.

[4] This expression must surely refer to martyrdom (since αἷμα is used so

that Apollos ever visited Rome; and a writer addressing the Jews of that city, and familiar with the Epistle to the Romans,[1] would hardly have ignored the existence of the Gentiles. Again, although this hypothesis would indeed account for the conviction of the Roman Church that the Epistle was not written by St. Paul, it would be difficult to explain why Clemens, who knew the Epistle—and who, if it had been sent to the Roman Church, must from the nature of the case have known the name of the writer—handed down no tradition on the subject. If we must single out one Church as the probable recipient of the letter, it would be the Jewish portion of the Church of EPHESUS, where both Apollos and Timotheus were well known, and in which they had both laboured.

The place *from* which the Epistle was written can only be a matter of guess, since there is nothing to indicate it, and least of all the expression "they of Italy" in xiii. 24. That clause, as we shall see, is quite vague. It may equally well imply that the Epistle was written in Italy, or in any Church in which there happened to be a few Italian Christians.

We hear of Apollos for the last time in the Epistle

often of the Blood of Christ, Eph. ii. 13; Rev. vi. 10, &c.), as μέχρις θανάτου does. 2 Macc. xiii. 14; Phil. ii. 8. The context also points to this meaning, and not to a pugilistic metaphor. It cannot be regarded as certain that ἔκβασιν in xiii. 7 means martyrdom.

[1] The following are some of the parallels between the Epistle to the Hebrews and that to the Romans:—

Rom. xii. 1—21.	Heb. xiii. 1—6; x. 30.
xiv. 7.	xiii. 9.
xv. 33.	xiii. 20.

In Heb. x. 30 there is a quotation which agrees neither with the Hebrew nor the LXX. of Deut. xxxii. 35, but is also found in Rom. xii. 19, ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω.

to Titus (iii. 13), where we find that he was expected in Crete during the course of some missionary journey. At that point he disappears from Christian history; but he will, as we believe, speak to the Church to the end of time in the eloquent teachings of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

" . . . Nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie, ecclesiarum lectione celebretur."—JER. *Ep.* 129, *ad Dardanum.*

"Das ist eine starke, mächtige, und höhe Epistel."—LUTHER.

"Of this ye see that the Epistle ought no more to be refused for a holy, godly, and catholic than the other authentic Scriptures."—TYNDALE.

SECTION I.

THE SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST.

"Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat."—*Inscription on Obelisk at Rome.*

HAVING now examined all that can be ascertained respecting the author of the Epistle, and the circumstances in which it originated, we are more in a position to follow the outline of its teachings. The writer's main object was to prevent the Jewish Christians from apostatising under the stress of persecution, by convincing them that they would find in the finality and transcendence of the Christian Faith a means of perfection and a path of blessedness which the shadow of their old ceremonial Judaism could never afford. This end he achieves by a comparison between Christianity and Judaism under the double aspect of (1) the *Mediators* between God and man, by whom they were respectively represented, and (2) the *nature of the blessings* which they were calculated to impart.

Of those five familiar divisions—greeting, thanks-

giving, didactic nucleus, resultant moral application, final salutations and benedictions—which constitute the normal structure of the Epistles of St. Paul, the first two are entirely wanting. The writer begins with the statement of his thesis, that God has given to the world by His Son the complete and final revelation of His will. Christians were taunted by Jews as apostates from Jehovah and renegades from Moses, who had abandoned the Law which had been delivered by the mediation of Angels, and had proved faithless to the Aaronic priesthood; they were told that by accepting as their Messiah a crucified malefactor they had forfeited all the blessings and promises of the Old Covenant. It is the object of the writer, FIRST, to convince them, with many an interwoven warning, that, on the contrary, Christ, as the Son of God, is above *all* mediators and *all* priests, and the sole means of perfect and confident access for all men to the Holy Sanctuary of God's Presence. He therefore proves that Christ is ABOVE ANGELS,[1] and that this supremacy was in no sense weakened by His earthly humiliation, which was the voluntary and predestined necessity whereby alone He could have effected His redeeming work; that He is ABOVE MOSES by His very nature; ABOVE JOSHUA, because He leads His people into their true and final rest; like Aaron in being called of God and in being able to sympathise with men, but ABOVE AARON, first because His Priesthood is eternal and not hereditary, and next because He is per-

[1] "Messiah is greater than the Patriarchs, Moses and the Ministering Angels."—*Yalkut Chadash*, f. 144, *b* (Schöttgen). I am also referred to *Yalkut Shimoni*, pt. 2, f. 53, 3: "He shall be exalted above Abraham and shall be extolled above Moses, and shall be more sublime than the Ministering Angels."

sonally sinless, and thirdly because His Priesthood was established by an oath, and most of all because of the incomparable benefits resulting from it. He is only to be paralleled by the mysterious MELCHIZEDEK, the kingly Priest of Peace, anterior and superior to Aaron, springing from another tribe than that of Levi, and belonging to an earlier and loftier dispensation than that of Sinai. He is at once the unchangeable Priest and the sinless sacrifice. And this change of Priesthood involves a change of the Law, and the introduction of a New Covenant, and an entrance into the true archetypal sanctuary which God made and not man.

Having thus in the first eight chapters shown the superiority of Christ to all those to whom was entrusted the dispensation of the Mosaic Covenant, he proceeds, SECONDLY, in the ninth and tenth chapters, to show the vast superiority of this New Covenant as the fulfilling of the shadowy types and symbols of the Mosaic Tabernacle, and as having rendered possible—not by the impotence of repeated animal sacrifices, but by the blood of Christ once offered—a perfect purification from sin. Under the New Covenant as under the Old there is sin and the need of expiation, and therefore in the New Covenant as in the Old there is a Temple, a Sacrifice, and a High Priest—only that these are not temporary, but eternal; not human, but Divine.[1]

On the basis of this double comparison of the two covenants as regards their *agents* and their *results* he passes, (1) into exhortations to confidence and steadfastness in that faith of which he records the many memorable triumphs; (2) into warnings against the awful peril

[1] See Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.* ii. 274.

of apostasy and willing sin; and (3) into practical inculcations of duties both general and special, ending with a few brief personal messages, and a single word of benediction.

The keynotes of the Epistle are the phrases, "BY HOW MUCH MORE" (ὅσῳ μᾶλλον), and "A BETTER COVENANT" (κρείττων διαθήκη).

In one grand sentence, eminently original in its expressions, and pregnant with thoughts which would be capable of almost indefinite expansion, the writer states the thesis on which he intends to base his warnings against the peril and folly of retrogression into an imperfect and abrogated dispensation.

"God, who in many portions[1] and in many manners[2] of old[3] spake to the fathers in the prophets,[4] at the end of these days[5] spake unto us in His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the world;[6] who being the effulgence[7] of His

[1] Not giving *at once* a final and perfect revelation, but revealing Himself part by part—lifting the veil fold by fold (1 Cor. xiii. 9, ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν).

[2] By promises, types, sacrifices, Urim, dreams, voices, similitudes, prophets specially commissioned.

[3] Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, lived B.C. 320.

[4] ἐν, like the Hebrew בְּיַד. Cf. 1 Sam. xxviii. 6; Matt. ix. 34.

[5] Compare ix. 26. A recognised Messianic expression, Dan. viii. 17; xii. 13. The "last days" date from Christ's Advent. They are the *Acharith hayamim*, the καιρὸς διορθώσεως and the συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων. With them ends the former dispensation (the *Olam hazzeh*, the αἰὼν οὗτος), and begins the *Olam habba*, or the μέλλων αἰών. The "last *days*" (Ja. v. 3) are to be ended by "the last crisis" (καιρὸς ἔσχατος, 1 Pet. i. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 1), after which come "the rest" and "the sabbatism;" but the "last *hour*" has begun (1 John ii. 18).

[6] *Lit.*, "The ages," Hebr. *Olamim*; but in *this* Epistle it means "the Universe," being used in its Rabbinic and post-Biblical sense, as in xi. 3, "by faith we believe κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας;" v. *infra ad loc.* Cf. Tobit xiii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 17; Col. i. 5; John i. 3—10.

[7] Cf. Wisd. vii. 26. Philo, *De Mund. Opif.* i. 35. "Light *of* (ἐκ) Light."

glory, and the stamp of His substance,[1] and sustaining all things by the utterance of His power,[2] after making purification of sins,[3] sat on the right hand of the Majesty in high places,[4] having proved Himself by so much better than the angels as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they."[5]

In this powerful introduction, of which the opening words alone are a marvellously instructive summary of the religious history of the world before Christ,[6] he declares the dawn of the last æon of God's earthly dispensations, by setting forth the supremacy of the Son of God over all created things, and the finality of His redemptive work. Apart from the stateliness and artistic balance of the language, we find in these three verses no less than *six* expressions which occur only in this Epistle,[7] and at least *nine* constructions[8] which, even when not rare in themselves, occur nowhere in St. Paul, together with others which occur but once in all his thirteen Epistles.

The manner in which the writer here introduces his

[1] In Philo, *De Monarch.* ii. p. 219, the Logos is compared to a seal-ring.

[2] Col. i. 17; Eph. vi. 10. Similarly Philo calls the Logos δεσμὸς τῶν ἁπάντων.

[3] E, K, L, M, Syr., Copt., Æthiop., &c., add δι' ἑαυτοῦ, "by His own act." This is in any case involved in the *middle* ποιησάμενος. In "purification" there may be a glance at *Yom Hakkippurim*, the Day of Atonement, ἡμέρα τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ. (Ex. xxix. 36, LXX.)

[4] The old "Ubiquitarian" controversy, as to whether "the right hand of God is *everywhere*," is now as dead as hundreds of other theological controversies once waged with much dogmatic bitterness.

[5] Namely, the title of "Only-begotten Son."

[6] The paronomasia of the first words, and the general style of the sentence, ought to have been sufficient to prove, on the very threshold, that the Epistle is not a *translation*.

[7] *Hapax legomena*, as far as the New Testament is concerned. πολυμερῶς, πολυτρόπως, ἀπαύγασμα, χαρακτήρ, μεγαλωσύνη, διαφορώτερον.

[8] πάλαι, λαλήσας, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, φέρων (in this sense), καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, τοσούτῳ . . ὅσῳ, κρείττων (in this sense), διαφορώτερον παρά.

subject is not only full of majesty, but it also goes straight to the point. In a tone which reminds us of the Christology of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians he sets forth the supreme exaltation of Christ as Light *of* (i.e., *from* ἐκ) Light and very God *of* very God[1]—as the enthroned exalted Purifier from sin. He specifies particularly His superiority to ANGELS. The necessity for doing this points not so much to those seductive influences of Essene speculation against which St. Paul argues in his Epistle to the Colossians—for here there seems to be no danger of the *worship* of Angels—but rather to the Judaic boastings that their fiery Law was uttered by the mediation of Angels on Mount Sinai, and must therefore be superior to any teaching of man. The exaltation of Angels was, both at this period and long afterwards, a tendency of Jewish thought. In the fourth book of Esdras we find many speculations about the greatness of Gabriel, Uriel, Michael, Raguel, Raphael, the starry and the sleepless ones.[2] In the almost contemporary Epistle of Clemens of Rome[3] the argument is again expanded and enforced. It was necessary, therefore, to show that Christ was not a mere man whom it was idolatry to adore, but that He was above all the heavenly Principalities and Powers; and even more than this—that men themselves, by virtue of Christ's work, were more concerned than Angels in the æon of future glory. That Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God,

[1] It is strange that the great majority of clergymen, in reading the Nicene Creed, should still say, "God ŏf God, Light ŏf Light"—which is surely quite meaningless—instead of "God *of* God, Light *of* Light."

[2] See *Supernat. Relig.* i. 93.

[3] Clem. *ad Cor.* 36.

he does not need to prove, because he is writing to those who had accepted Him as their Messiah; but it was necessary to show that this Messiah was Divine, and that even the angelic heralds of Sinai[1] shrank into insignificance in comparison with His eternal and final work.

This he proceeds to prove in the remainder of the chapter by that Scriptural method which was to the Jews more conclusive than any other, and with which the writings of St. Paul have already made us familiar. He does so in a mosaic of magnificent quotations from the second, the ninety-seventh, the forty-fifth, and the hundred and second Psalms, and from Deuteronomy and the Second Book of Samuel.

"For to which of the angels said He ever, My Son art thou; to-day have I begotten thee?[2] And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?[3] And when He, again,[4] bringeth the firstborn into the habitable world, He saith, And let all the Angels of God worship Him.[5] And of the Angels He saith, Who maketh His angels winds, and His ministers a flame

[1] Apollos gives no sanction to Philo's distinction that the Ten Commandments were uttered by the immediate voice of God, and the rest of the Law by angels.

[2] Ps. ii. 7; on its Messianic interpretation compare Rom. i. 4; Acts xiii. 3. Kimchi and Rashi testify to this being the ancient view. The whole clause must be taken together, for angels are called sons in Job i. 6; Dan. iii. 25; and in LXX. (A) Ps. xxix. 1; Deut. xiv. 1, etc. "To-day"—a part of "God's Eternal now."

[3] 2 Sam. vii. 14; Philo, *Leg. Allegg.* iii. 8. The allusion is perhaps to the Incarnation.

[4] If the "again" merely introduces a new quotation, as in i. 5; ii. 13; iv. 5, etc., there is no difficulty except the very strange misplacement (hyperbaton). But it seems better to apply it prophetically to the Final Advent, though I have left the translation ambiguous, as the original is.

[5] Ps. xcvii. 7 (cf. Deut. xxxii. 43). The LXX., the Syriac, and the Vulgate render *Elohim* by "angels," as in Ps. viii. 6, etc.; the Chaldee, by "all who worship idols."

of fire;[1] but to the Son, thy throne, O God,[2] is for ever and ever. And the sceptre of rectitude is the sceptre of thy[3] kingdom. Thou lovedst righteousness, and hatedst lawlessness; therefore did God, thy God, anoint thee with the oil of exultation above thy fellows[4] And, thou, O Lord, in the beginning didst found the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest. And they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a mantle shalt thou roll them up,[5] and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.[6] But to which of the angels has He said at any time, Sit at My right hand until I make thine enemies a footstool of thy feet?[7] Are they not all ministrant spirits,[8] sent forth for service for the sake of those who are about to inherit salvation?"[9]

This mode of argument, by Scriptural quotation, has

[1] Ps. civ. 4. Both ἀγγέλους and πνεύματα are dubious; ἀγγέλους means either "messengers" or "*angels*"; πνεύματα either "winds" or "*spirits*." The context shows that the *latter* meanings are intended *here*. In the original *the context* seems to demand an inversion, *i.e.*, "He maketh the winds His messengers, the flaming fire His ministers"—but *grammatical* considerations make this difficult to accept. See Perowne, *The Psalms*, ii. 229, 237. Further, the Rabbinic notion was that the angels could "clothe themselves with the changing garment of natural phenomena," and be changed into wind and flame (Wetst. and Schöttgen, *ad loc.*).

[2] Ps. xlv. 6, 7.

[3] Or "His kingdom," ℵ.

[4] Here all the ancient versions render *Elohim* as a vocative; moderns render it "Thy Divine throne," as 1 Chron. xxix. 23. The Jews have never doubted its Messianic interpretation, and the Chald. Paraphrast on ver. 3 was. "Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is greater than that of the Son of men" (Schöttgen). See Perowne, i. 357.

[5] ἑλίξεις. ℵ, D, read ἀλλάξεις, as in Hebrew and in the Alexandrian MS. of the LXX., which this Epistle generally follows.

[6] Ps. cii. 25. Although "O Lord" (Κύριε) is not in the original, a Christian, writing to Christians who accepted Christ as the Messiah, might quote these verses in a Messianic application, especially as he has already said, "By whom also He made the world."

[7] Ps. cx. 1. The fact that this Psalm was prominently used by our Lord without dispute in a Messianic sense shows incontestably that in the Priest-King after the order of Melchizedek all readers, Jewish as well as Christian, would at once accept a type of the Messiah.

[8] They render service (λειτουργία) to God, and aid (διακονία) to men.

[9] Heb. i. 5—14.

X

been made a needless stumbling-block, on the ground that some of the passages here adduced in proof of Christ's exaltation were originally addressed to David and Solomon, and had a directly historical reference. That such passages did really have such a primary reference no fair reasoner is likely to deny; but to assert that they had such a reference *only* is to repudiate an interpretation which they may obviously bear, and which had been attached to them by the nation among whom they originated for centuries before, as well as for centuries after, the coming of Our Lord. Let us take these quotations in order. No one will question that the second Psalm was originally a song of trust and anticipated triumph in times of gathering war; that the words of 2 Sam. vii. 14 were, in the first instance, addressed to Solomon; that in Ps. xcvii. 7 (if that be the source of the quotation), or in Deut. xxxii. 43—the song of Moses—the "Elohim" are bidden to worship God; that the forty-fifth Psalm was an epithalamium for Solomon, or one of his successors; that in Ps. cii. 25 the "O Lord" does not exist in the Hebrew, and that the words are addressed to Jehovah; that even the hundred and tenth Psalm must have had a contemporary and historic meaning. And this being so, if any one were to adduce these citations as a proof of the supremacy of Jesus Christ over the angels to one who began by denying altogether the Messianic import of the Old Testament, the arguments could not have any weight until this method of applying the Old Testament had been justified. But to pass through these preliminary reasonings was in this case needless. Apollos is arguing with the Hebrews, and arguing with them on admitted principles. Those

Hebrews were Christians. He had no need to begin by proving to them that Jesus was the Messiah. That part of his work had been mightily accomplished many years before. It would have been necessary only for unconverted Jews, whom he is not addressing. But even Jews, if they were once convinced on this point, would have been compelled to accept his further arguments. Their whole religion was ultimately resolvable into a Messianic hope, and their whole method of Scriptural study was Messianic application. It was an accepted rule of their interpretation that everything which the Prophets had spoken they had spoken of the Messiah. Calvin, in his great commentary, thinks it sufficient to say that the New Testament writers make a pious use of such passages by infusing into them a new meaning.[1] But no Jewish scribe or Christian Apostle would have regarded himself as making a strained use of these quotations. To such readers the passages derived their chief importance from the prophetic meaning which had always been assigned to them. The Christological application cannot, and is not meant to, disturb the historical foundation of such passages; but mystical extensions of the language, and inferential deductions from it, were in the inmost nature of things perfectly tenable, and constituted, indeed, the very essence of Jewish exegesis.

But it may be said that, however conclusive this method of argument and citation may have been to the Jews, it cannot be so to us. It would be useless and dishonest to ignore that such a remark is natural. The objection was felt so strongly even by Cardinal Cajetan

[1] "Piâ deflectione ad Christi personam accommodat" (Calvin, *in Eph.* iv. 8). He calls this method of application ἐπεξεργασία.

that he says, "It is not quite becoming that so great an Apostle should use such an argument in a matter of so much importance."[1] My reply is that the argument can and ought to be, if not logically conclusive, yet full of weight and instruction to us. It may be that the whole result of our training, and our entire method of criticism lead us to attach more exclusive import to the primary application of the Old Testament, and not to allow its full force to the Messianic presentiment which largely moulded the language of Scripture. Yet how is it possible for us to deny that the Jews had read these texts in a Messianic sense for ages before Christ was born, and in many instances continue so to accept them? Is it not further true that these utterances *have* received a fulfilment such as was attributed to them, and a fulfilment more universal and magnificent than was ever anticipated by those who received or those who uttered them? Is it not true that Jewish literature is the embodiment of Jewish religion; that the very heart and soul of Jewish religion was the Messianic faith; and that in Christ that Messianic faith has found its most glorious accomplishment? A pious Jewish interpreter might carry a modern critic with him when he said that much of the language of the Old Testament respecting the ideal Man—the ideal Jashar—the ideal Israel—the ideal seed of David and of Abraham, COULD only find its true and full meaning in the promised Messiah. The very name *Adam*, said the Rabbis, involves the names *A*dam, *D*avid, *M*essiah; so that the mystery of Adam is the mystery of the Messiah.[2] The

[1] "Minus decet in tantâ re tantum Apostolum uti tali argumento." *Comment.* (*ap.* Tholuck, 66).

[2] Nishmath Chajim, f. 152, *b*.

Rabbinic *Midrash* on Ps. civ. 1 is that God lent "glory" to Moses, and "honour" to Joshua; but, according to Ps. xxi. 6, He meant to lend *both* to King Messiah. The New Testament quotations are all based on the principle, nowhere more powerfully expounded than in this Epistle, that the New Testament is latent in the Old, and the Old is laid open in the New—that both are but parts of one system of Divine ideas, moments in the course of one progressive revelation.

With the extent to which the Old Testament writers themselves realised the force of their own utterances we are not immediately concerned. "Their words meant more than they." The Spirit who, entering into their holy souls, made them Sons of God and Prophets, gave them the large utterance which has reached over three thousand years, and of which the final consummation is yet afar. The grandeur of prophecy did not consist in mechanical predictions, but in the Faith which enabled the Chosen People to support with unflinching allegiance the cause of right, and in the Hope which burned with unquenchable brightness even in the depths of universal gloom.

But when we have given their fullest weight to these considerations, we must still admit that the tendency of our exegesis is different from that of the Jews. We find in this and other Epistles a style of Scriptural application which comes home with less force to us than it did to its earlier readers. We must, however, remember that this mode of argument was once both necessary and convincing, although to us, with the widening knowledge of centuries, it is no longer indispensable. The argument from some of the Messianic Psalms is undoubtedly to be taken

into account among the other evidences of Christianity. If there are other Psalms which can be regarded as having no such evidential value, except to those who accept the ancient methods of interpretation—if the Prophetic evidence appeals to us with less force than of old—the Historic evidences of Christianity have, on the other hand, been incomparably strengthened. Different methods of argument appeal with varying force to different ages. This is nothing more than we should have expected from the fact that God never willed to reveal at once the whole mystery of His dispensations. His revelations (as we have just been told) come to us gradually like the dawn—fragmentarily and multifariously—in many portions, in many ways.

SECTION II.

A SOLEMN EXHORTATION.

Having thus proved the superiority of Christ to Angels, the writer pauses for a word of warning.

"On this account we ought more abundantly to pay heed to the things heard, lest perchance we should drift away from them.[1] For if the word uttered by means of angels[2] proved steadfast, and every

[1] *παραῤῥυῶμεν*, 2nd aor. subj. pass. of *παραῤῥεῖν*. Cf. Prov. iii. 21, LXX., *υἱὲ μὴ παραρρυῇς . . . ἐμὴν βουλήν*. It is the opposite of *τηρεῖν*. "Lest peradventure we fleten away" (*Wiclif*). "Let them slip" first appears in the Genevan Bible of 1560.

[2] Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxviii. 17; Jos. *Antt.* xv. 5, 3. See on these Angels at Sinai my *Life and Work of St. Paul*, ii. 149. The prominence given to the angelic mediators of the Law is still more observable in the Talmud, the Targums, the Midrashim, &c.; and in the tract "Maccoth" we are informed that the only words actually spoken by God were the *First* Commandment.

transgression and neglect[1] received a just recompense of reward, how shall we[2] make good our escape[3] if we neglect so great a salvation? which, having begun to be uttered through the Lord, was ratified to us by them that heard,[4] God attesting it with them by signs and portents, and various powers, and distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to His will" (ii. 1—4).

After this exhortation the thread of argument is resumed, and he proceeds to show that this destined supremacy of man over Angels was foretold in the Scriptures, and has been fulfilled in Jesus. He won supreme glory by willing suffering, in order to share the trials of those whom He is to sanctify and lead to glory as sons of God. This brotherhood of man with Christ is illustrated by passages from Psalm xxii. and Is. viii., and the chapter concludes with a pregnant summary of the reasons why it was—from the human point of view—necessary that Christ should condescend to incarnation and death. It was that He might bring to nought the lord of Death, and liberate men from the lifelong terror of death—it being His aim to aid men and not angels, and to be made like men that He might show the sympathy of the Infinite with the finite by actually sharing in their trials and their life.

"For not to angels did He subject the age to be,[5] respecting

[1] παράβασις, sins of commission; παρακοή, of omission.

[2] "The child owes a deeper debt than the servant."

[3] ἐκφευξόμεθα.

[4] St. Paul would never have written thus. He always insists most strongly on the independence of his call, his revelation, and his gospel (Gal. i. 1, &c.).

[5] Heb. vi. 5. In the Old Testament the "Age to be" is the Messianic Age. But when the Messianic Age had dawned—when *this* "future age" (*olam habba*) had become "present" (*olam hazzeh*)—then Christians were still led to look forward to yet another "future age." The *olam habba* is the Christian dispensation, in its *present* existence here, which involves its

which we speak. But one somewhere[1] testified, saying, What is man[2] that thou rememberest him? or the son of man, that thou lookest upon him? Thou loweredst him a little in comparison to the angels;[3] with glory and honour thou crownedst him; all things didst thou subject beneath his feet. For in subjecting the universe to him, He left nothing unsubjected to him; but now we see[4] not yet the universe subjected to him, but we look upon[5] Him who has been for a little time made low in comparison of angels—even Jesus—on account of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour,[6] in order that by the grace of God[7] He may taste death[8] on behalf of every man. For it became Him, for whose sake are all things, and by whose means are all things—in bringing many sons to glory—

future perfectionment. The *olam hazzeh*, or "*this* Age" (αἰὼν οὗτος), might be applied to the period before the destruction of Jerusalem, regarded in its Jewish, Heathen, and *imperfect* Christian aspect; and the "present world," in *this* sense, *was* subjected to angels (Deut. xxxii. 8, LXX., "according to the number of the angels of God;" Dan. x. 13, 20, 21; Tobit xii. 15). In point of fact, the horizon of the "Age to be" is one which must ever fade before us until we reach the end of *this* Age, and of all things.

[1] This vague method of quotation is found also in Philo and the Rabbis. Generally, each quotation is referred to "God" or "the Holy Spirit," but that method could not be here adopted, because God is addressed.

[2] אֱנוֹשׁ—man in his humiliation and weakness.

[3] Heb. *Elohim*. [4] ὁρῶμεν. [5] βλέπομεν.

[6] On the connexion of the Crown with the Cross compare Phil. ii. 5—11 ("via crucis, via lucis").

[7] The reading χωρὶς Θεοῦ was found by Origen in most manuscripts, and by Jerome in some ("*absque Deo*, in quibusdam exemplaribus"). Theodore of Mopsuestia spoke with contempt of the reading χάριτι, as meaningless; but χωρίς seems to be either an accidental misreading of χάριτι, or a marginal gloss on τὰ πάντα ("might taste death for everything except God"). (Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 27.) The Nestorians, however (and even St. Ambrose and Fulgentius), interpreted it, "might, *apart from His Divinity* (*i. e.*, in His human nature only), taste death." If accepted, it *can* only mean "that He may taste death for every being, God excepted" (1 Cor. xv. 27). Drs. Westcott and Hort (Greek Test. ii. 129) regard it as a Western and Syrian reading which sprang from an accidental confusion of letters.

[8] A common Semitic metaphor, from the notion that Death gives a cup to drink. In the Arabian poem "Antar" we find, "Death gave him a cup of absinth by my hand."

to perfect by means of sufferings the Captain[1] of their salvation. For the Sanctifier and they who are being sanctified are all from one, for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise to thee.[2] And again, I will put my trust in Him; and again, Lo, I and the children which God gave me.[3] Since then the children have shared in blood and flesh,[4] He Himself also similarly partook in the same things, in order that by means of death He may render impotent him that hath the power of death, that is the devil,[5] and may set free those who by fear of death through their whole life were subjects of slavery. For assuredly[6] it is not angels whom He takes by the hand, but it is the seed of Abraham whom He takes by the hand.[7] Wherefore it behoved

[1] ἀρχηγόν (Acts v. 31). In Acts iii. 15 it means "the Leader" in the sense of "the Author" or "Originator." Comp. xii. 2, *Herzog ihrer Seligkeit* (Luther).

[2] Ps. xxii., a typico-prophetic Psalm (Matt. xxvii. 46). It is headed in our Hebrew Bibles, "On the hind of the dawn," which the Midrash Tehillin explains to mean, "On him who leaps—as a stag—and brightens the world in the time of darkness" (Mic. vii. 8). R. Chija explained it of the *gradual redemption* of Israel.

[3] The verse continues, "Behold I and the children which God gave me (viz., Mahershalalhashbaz and Shearjashub), *are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts*" (Is. viii. 18). The names of those two sons ("Speed-plunder-haste-spoil" and "A remnant shall remain") were symbolical, as also was their whole position. It indicated the relation of the chosen part of the people towards God. These texts are not (in our sense of the word) *proofs*, but only symbols and illustrations.

[4] This (as in Eph. vi. 12) is the order in A, B, C, D, E, M.

[5] Compare Phil. ii. 9: "He humbled Himself, becoming subject to death, &c." The Devil has the power of death, not as Lord, but as executioner. (Cf. John viii. 44, ἀνθρωπόκτονος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; Rev. xii. 10.) Wisd. ii. 24, "By the envy of the Devil death entered into the world." The Jews called Sammael the "Angel of Death," and he was the Devil (Eisenmenger, p. 821).

[6] Δήπου (*opinor*) in Classic Greek has a semi-ironical tinge. It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or LXX., but is common in Philo.

[7] *Sc.*, "to help and rescue" (Matt. xiv. 31, &c.; cf. viii. 9). Wisd. iv. 11, "Wisdom . . . . takes by the hand those that seek her." By the "seed of Abraham" there can be no doubt that the writer means Jews, because throughout the whole Epistle he has them exclusively in view; but of course he did not for a moment dream of *excluding* the spiritual Israel.

Him[1] in all respects to be made like to His brethren, in order that He may *prove* Himself merciful, and a faithful high priest in things that relate to God, to expiate the sins[2] of the people. For in that sphere wherein[3] He suffered by being Himself tempted, He is able to succour them that are being tempted" (ii. 5—18).

Having thus introduced the word "High Priest," he might have proceeded at once to that proof of the nature and superiority of Christ's High Priesthood, which is the central idea of the Epistle. But he was arguing with Jews who raised Moses to a pedestal of almost Divine eminence, in their enthusiasm for his work as a mediator between God and their nation.[4] It

[1] The obligation is involved in the *purpose* of Christ's assimilation to man.

[2] ἱλάσκεσθαι, "to expiate" or "propitiate." It is never connected with "God," or "the wrath of God," either in the LXX. or N.T., because, as Delitzsch says, man must not regard sacrifice as an act by which he induces God to show him grace; just as it is nowhere said that Christ's sacrifice propitiated *God's wrath*, as though that sacrifice had in any way anticipated God's own gracious purpose (see Rom. iii. 25; Eph. ii. 10). It represents the Hebrew *Kippeer*, "to cover." Comp. Ecclus. iii. 3, "whoso honoureth his father *maketh an atonement for his sins*;" 30, "Alms *maketh an atonement* for sins;" xx. 28 and xxxiv. 19, "Neither is he pacified for sin by the multitude of sacrifices."

[3] The E.V. renders ἐν ᾧ "in that"—*i.e.*, "forasmuch as,"—like the Hebrew *ba-asher*; but it is more simple to make it mean, "in that particular wherein." Comp. vi. 17; Rom. viii. 3.

[4] This will be seen at once by a few extracts from the Talmud about Moses. They may be found in Hamburger's *Wörterb.* and Mr. Hershon's *Genesis*:—

"Three things did Moses ask of God: (1) He asked that the Shechinah might rest upon Israel; (2) That the Shechinah might rest upon none but Israel; and (3) That God's ways might be made known unto him. And all these requests were granted."—(Berachoth, f. 7, *a.*)

"The soul of Moses, our Rabbi, embraced all the souls of Israel, as it is said, Moses was equivalent to all Israel" ("Moses our Rabbi" is in Hebrew, by Gematria, = 613, which is the numerical value also of the Hebrew words for "Lord God of Israel").—(Kitzur sh'lu, p. 2.) Hershon, *Miscellany*, p. 322.

"The Angels asked the Holy One, Blessed be He . . . . Why did Moses and Aaron die, who fulfilled the whole Law? He answered,

was desirable, therefore, to pause and show that Christ was superior not only to the angels by whose *instrumentality*, but also to Moses by whose immediate *agency*, the Law was delivered to Israel. In doing this he follows the lines of his previous demonstration. He has shown that the angels were but "ministering spirits," and that the Son is, in His very nature, more exalted than they (i. 5—14); and then, after a few words of exhortation (ii. 1—5), he has proved that in Christ our human nature is also to be elevated above the angels in the "future age" or true Messianic kingdom (ii. 6—16), since Christ as our High Priest took part in that nature (ii. 17, 18). He now proceeds to show that Christ is higher than Moses, inasmuch as the Son is higher than the minister (iii. 1—6); and then, after another exhortation (iii. 7—19), that the future belongs to Christ, and not to Moses, because Christ achieved the work of bringing Israel into the promised rest, a work which Moses had left imperfect (iv. 1—13). The angels had come in the name of God before Israel, and Moses had come in the name of Israel before God; the High Priest came in the name of God before Israel, wearing the name Jehovah on the golden *petalon* upon his forehead, and in the name of Israel before God, bearing the names of their tribes on the oracular gems upon his breast. Christ is above the Angels, as Son of God and Lord of the future world, and

There is one event to the righteous and the wicked."—(Shabbath, f. 55, *b.*)

"Moses' face was like the sun, Joshua's like the face of the moon" (Num. xxvii. 27).—(Bava Bathra, f. 75, *a.*)

"All the Prophets saw through a dim glass, but Moses saw through a clear glass."—(Yevamoth, f. 49, *b.*)

"Fifty gates of understanding were created in the world; all but one were opened to Moses."—(Rosh Hashanah, f. 21, *b.*)

is not only the messenger of God to men, but as High Priest is the propitiatory representative of men before God. The distinctive exaltation of Christ above Angels and above Moses as regards His mediatorial work, rests in His High-Priestly office—a truth which is stated in that hortatory form which continually asserts itself throughout these two chapters.[1]

"Wherefore,[2] holy brethren,[3] partakers of a heavenly calling,[4] contemplate the Apostle[5] and High Priest of our profession, Jesus. as faithful to Him that made Him (such),[6] as also Moses was

[1] This parallelism of structure between chapters iii., iv. and i., ii. is well drawn out by Ebrard:—

I. Christ higher than ministering spirits (i. 5—14).	II. Christ higher than Moses, because the Son is higher than the servant (iii. 1—6).
Exhortation (ii. 1—5).	Exhortation (iii. 7—19).
He raises humanity above angelhood (ii. 6—16).	In Him Israel has entered into rest (iv. 1—13).
For He was our High Priest (ii. 17, 18).	Thus He is also our High Priest (iv. 14—16).

[2] Ὅθεν—*i.e.*, Since we have such a helper. Ὅθεν (ii. 17; viii. 3) is never once used in the Epistles of St. Paul (though once in a speech, Acts xxvi. 19), and only elsewhere in 1 John ii. 18.

[3] A mode of address never once used by St. Paul.

[4] "Heavenly," because *from* heaven and calling *to* heaven.

[5] Ἀπόστολον, because "sent from the Father" (ἀπεσταλμένον παρὰ Πατρός), as the High Priest was sometimes regarded as a messenger (*Sheliach*) from God (John x. 36); *sent* by God as an Apostle to us; going from us as a High Priest to God; and, therefore, most strictly a Mediator. The title is referred to by Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 12 and 63, where he says that the Word of God is called an angel, because He announces (ἀπαγγέλλει), and an Apostle because He is sent (ἀποστέλλεται).

[6] The expression "To Him that made Him" (τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν), which might be taken superficially to indicate that Christ was a *created being*, caused the genuineness of the Epistle to be suspected (Philastr. *Haer.* 89). But even if this sense were necessary, it would merely refer to Christ's human birth (*corporalis generatio*, Primasius), as Athanasius understood it. It cannot possibly refer (as Bleek and Lünemann suppose) to His Eternal generation, though they rightly urge that ποιῶ, with an accusative, usually means to create or make. It is simpler to understand it, "Who made

faithful in all His house.[1] For He hath been deemed worthy of more glory than Moses, in proportion as He who established the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is established by some one, but He who established all things is God. And Moses indeed was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony to the things which were to be afterwards spoken;[2] but Christ as a Son over His (God's) house, whose house are we[3] if we hold fast the confidence and ground of boasting of our hope firm unto the end"[4] (iii. 1—6).

Then follows a powerful appeal to faith and faithfulness,[5] founded on the exhortation in the ninety-fifth Psalm, to hear God's voice "to-day,"[6] and not to harden the heart against Him,[7] as the Israelites had done at Massah and at Meribah,[8] which had resulted in God's oath that they should not enter into His rest.[9]

Him an Apostle and High Priest." Compare 1 Sam. xii. 6 (ὁ ποίησας τὸν Μωυσῆν); Mark iii. 14; Acts ii. 36, "God made Him Lord and Christ." So the Greek Fathers understood it: τί ποίησαντι; ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα (Chrys.); ποίησιν . . . τὴν χειροτονίαν κέκληκεν (Theodoret).

[1] An allusion to Num. xii. 7. His (*i.e.*, God's) House.

[2] "By Christ" (Deut. xviii. 15).

[3] "How we ought to walk in the *House of God*, seeing that it is *the Church* of the Living God" (1 Tim. iii. 15). "Ye are the Temple of God" (1 Cor. iii. 16).

[4] The "firm unto the end" is omitted in B.

[5] The διὸ of iii. 7 refers on to the βλέπετε of ver. 12, the intervening words being a long parenthesis.

[6] The Hebrew of Ps. xcv. 6 rather is, "O that ye would hear His voice;" but this ejaculatory wish is often rendered in the LXX. by ἐάν (cf. Ps. cxxxviii. 19).

[7] Remarkable, as Bleek observes, because it is the only place where *man* is said to harden his own *heart*, which is usually ascribed immediately to God (Ex. vii. 3, and *passim;* Is. lxiii. 17; Rom. ix. 16). Man is usually said to stiffen his neck (Deut. x. 16, &c.) or back (2 Kings xvii. 14). But we have "but since some hardened themselves" (ὡς δέ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο), Acts xix. 9.

[8] The writer follows the LXX. in rendering it "In the embitterment," as though the Seventy had here read "Marah" for "Meribah." In Ex. xvii. 1—7 they render it *Loidorēsis*, or "Reproach." Massah and Meribah were two different places (Num. xx. 1—13).

[9] Num. xiv. 28—30.

The "to-day" of the Psalm, repeated by David five hundred years afterwards, showed that the "to-day" of God's offered mercy had not been exhausted in the wilderness.[1] God had offered "a rest" to His people, but through unbelief they had failed to enter into it (iii. 7—19).[2] "Let us then fear," he says, "lest haply, though a promise is still left us of entering into His rest, any one of you should seem to have failed in attaining it.[3] For indeed we too, just as they, have had a Gospel preached to us, but the word of hearing benefited not them, since they had not been tempered in faith with them that heard it."[4]

[1] "Few things in the Epistle," says Dr. Moulton, "are more remarkable than the constant presentation of the thought that Scripture language is *permanent*, and at all times *present*." As regards the forty years in the wilderness, it is remarkable that forty years was also the period between the Crucifixion and the Fall of Jerusalem, and that according to Rabbi Akhiva the years of the Messiah were to be forty years (Tanchuma, f. 79, 4). So, too, R. Eliezer, referring expressly to Ps. xcv. 10 (Sanhedr. f. 99, *a*). The word "always" in ver. 10 is not in the original, but is either due to loose citation (for, as Calvin says, "Scimus apostolos in citandis testimoniis magis attendere ad summum rei quam de verbis esse solicitos"), or to some slight difference of reading. The "if they shall enter" is a Hebraism for "they shall not enter" (cf. ver. 18). It is really due to a suppressed apodosis (Mk. viii. 12).

[2] In ver. 10 he says "with this generation" (א, A, B, D, M) for the "that" of the LXX.—no doubt intentionally (compare Matt. xxiii. 36; xxiv. 34). In ver. 15 ὑπόστασις is "confidence," as in Ps. xxxviii. 7, "My sure hope (LXX. ὑπόστασις) is in Thee."

[3] The δοκῇ is used by a sort of litotes to suggest to the conscience of each a stronger term. Ebrard renders it "lest any of you think that he has come too late for it," which is a perfectly tenable rendering, but unsuitable here, because the object is warning against presumption, not encouragement against despair.

[4] This is a strange expression, and the reading συγκεκραμένος in the E. V. is certainly much simpler; but it is for that very reason suspicious when we find συγκεκρασμένους in A, B, C, D, and συνκεκερασμένους in M. The meaning will then be, as in the text, that the Word did not profit the rebellions Israelites because they were not blended with Joshua and Caleb in their faith. Westcott and Hort suspect the possibility of the reading τοῖς ακουσθεῖσιν, or even of Noesselt's conjecture τοῖς ἀκούσμασιν.

"For we who believed are entering into that rest." This he proceeds to prove by the argument that God has long ago entered into *His* rest after the worlds were made; and it had been evidently intended that some men should enter that rest of God. Since, then, those who had first heard the glad tidings of promise had *not* entered into God's rest, as a punishment for their disobedience, the promise was repeated ages afterwards. For again, after so long a time, God had in the Psalm of David used the limiting term "to-day."[1] Clearly, therefore, Joshua[2] had not led Israel into any real or final rest. If he had done so the promise of rest would not have needed to be renewed.[3] There still remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God. For any Christian who entered into his rest (by death) ceased from his labours, as God ceased from His own labours.

"Let us, then, be earnest to enter into that rest, that no one fall into the same example of disobedience. For living[4] is the word of God,[5] and effectual, and keener than any two-edged sword, and cleaving through even to the severance of soul and spirit, of joints and

[1] iv. 4, *εἴρηκε*, "He (God) hath said"—a method of citation not once used in St. Paul's Epistles.

[2] iv. 8. The unfortunate rendering "Jesus" in this verse might seem as if it were expressly designed to perplex ignorant readers.

[3] iv. 8, *οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει*, "He would not have been speaking of another day." The imperfect is in accordance with the writer's habit of seeing things *in their ideal continuity*.

[4] "*Living* oracles" (Acts vii. 38).

[5] Clearly not here the personal Logos in St. John's sense, though many Fathers and divines, who wrote far more from the theological than from the critical point of view, have so understood it. No doubt that meaning may lie in the background, but if so, the writer has purposely *left* it in the background; for again and again such a usage seems to be hovering on his lips, and yet he does not actually adopt it. It was left for the inspired genius of St. John to adopt the term "THE WORD" into the theology of Christianity, and in adopting it to glorify every previous and analogous usage of it (*vide* vol. ii. p. 368). The word of God is here the written and

marrow,[1] and a discerner of the thoughts and conceptions of the heart. And there is not a created thing unseen in His presence, but all things are naked and laid prostrate[2] to His eyes. To whom our account must be given."[3]

SECTION III.

THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

Then follows the transitional exhortation to the long proof and illustration of the following chapters.

"Having, then, a great High Priest who has passed through the heavens—Jesus, the Son of God—let us hold fast our confession. For[4] we have not a High Priest who cannot sympathise with our

spoken word of God, of which again and again the writer shows that he has a most vivid perception as a living reality; there may also be a sort of semi-personification. The comparison was also familiar to Philo, as in *Quis rer. div. hæres*, § 27 : "Thus God having whetted that Word of His which cutteth all things, divides the shapeless and unformed essence of all things." It is clear from the context that the passage was known to the writer, for Philo also speaks of the Word as penetrating even to things called invisible, and separating the different parts of the soul. We find the same figure in Ps. lvii. 5, &c.; Rev. i. 16; Wisd. xviii. 15, 16. "Thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven . . . . and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword, and standing up filled all things with death."

[1] That is, the Word of God pierces not only the natural soul, but also the Divine Spirit, and even to the very depths of these. "*Animâ* (ψυχῇ) vivimus, *spiritu* (πνεύματι) intelligimus," Primas. Μερισμοῦ may mean the "joint" or "articulation." It should be observed that while the *expressions* recall those of Philo, the *application* of them is wholly different.

[2] τετραχηλισμένα. The word has been rendered, (1) "seized by the throat and overthrown"; (2) "bent back by the neck, like malefactors" (Bleck, &c.); (3) "flayed" (Chrys.), or "anatomised" (by the Priest in his μωμοσκοπία, or inspection of victims), or "manifested" (Hesych., Phavorin), or "sacrificed" (Theodoret). But "*laid prostrate*" is almost undoubtedly the right meaning, since the word is constantly used in that sense by Philo.

[3] Heb. iv. 11—13. This may also be, as in the E. V. (more generally) —"with whom we have to do." It would be very tame to make it mean "with reference to whom we are speaking" (as in v. 11).

[4] [And we may do this with perfect confidence], "for"—the "for" anticipates an objection ("occupat objectionem," Schlichting).

weaknesses, but one who has been tempted in all respects just as we are, apart from sin. Let us approach, then,[1] with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace for a seasonable succour" (iv. 14—16).

The predominance of the thought of Christ's High Priesthood in the mind of the writer has already been shown, not only by the two last verses, but by his two previous allusions to it. In ii. 17 he had said by anticipation that it was necessary for Christ to take a human, not an angelic, nature from the moral necessity for His being made like unto His brethren, "that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God." In iii. 1 he had solemnly invited his hearers to the contemplation of Christ as our High Priest. It had been necessary for him to pause for a moment to show that Christ was greater even than Moses, and to invite his readers by a solemn appeal to strive to enter into that rest which some of those whom Moses led out of Egypt had failed to attain. The true rest which Moses had promised was a rest typified by the Sabbath-rest of God. It pointed far beyond the possession of Canaan to the *final* rest which remaineth for the people of God. CHRIST'S HIGH PRIESTHOOD is a pledge to us of a grace by which that rest may be obtained.

We thus reach the very heart of the Epistle, for the development of this topic occupies nearly six chapters.

First he lays down two qualifications which must be found in every High Priest, namely,—

i. That he must be able to sympathise with men by

[1] προσέρχεσθαι is a favourite word with this writer (vii. 25; x. 1, 22 xi. 6; xii. 18—22), though only found once in St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 3), and then in an entirely different sense, "take heed." We have, however, "access" (προσαγωγὴ) in Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12.

participation with them in their infirmities (v. 1—3, comp. ii. 17); and,

ii. That he must not be self-called, but appointed by God (4—10).

That Christ possessed the first of these qualifications was self-evident, and had indeed been expressly stated (comp. ii. 17).

That He possessed the second he proves by a reference to His eternal Sonship (Ps. ii. 7) and His Melchizedek Priesthood (Ps. cx. 4).

He then pauses once more during a somewhat long digression to express his sorrow that their spiritual dulness and backwardness made it needlessly difficult for him to illustrate these deep truths (v. 11—14). He therefore urges them to more earnest endeavours after Christian progress (vi. 1—3), partly by an awful warning of the danger of relapse from truth (4—8), and partly by encouragements derived from the activity of their Christian benevolence (9, 10) and the immutable certainty of the promises of God (11—18). These inspire a hope founded on this Priesthood of our Lord (19, 20), which was a Priesthood not merely Aaronic, but transcendent and eternal after the order of Melchizedek.

Having thus cleared away every preliminary consideration, and raised them by his warnings and exhortations to a state of mind sufficiently solemn for the consideration of the subject, he proceeds to show that in many most important particulars the Priesthood of Melchizedek was superior to that of Aaron; namely—

i. Because it is eternal, not transient (vii. 1—3).

ii. Because even Abraham acknowledged the superior

dignity of Melchizedek, by paying tithes to him and receiving his blessing (4—10).

iii. Because the Priesthood of Melchizedek is recognised in the Psalms as loftier than that of Aaron,—which implied a change in the Priesthood, and therefore in the Law (11, 12). This is confirmed by the fact that the Lord sprang from the tribe of Judah, not from that of Levi (13, 14); and from the fact that the Melchizedek Priesthood, being eternal, could not be connected with a Law which perfected nothing (15—19).

iv. Because the Melchizedek Priesthood was founded, as the Aaronic never was, by an oath (20—22).

v. Because the Levitic priests died, but Chris abideth for ever (23—25).

He then pauses to dwell for a moment on the eternal fitness of Christ's Priesthood to fulfil the conditions which the needs of humanity require; and proceeds to show that as Christ's *Priesthood* is superior to that of Aaron, so is His *Ministry* more excellent as belonging to a better Covenant (viii. 1—6). This is mainly proved by the fact that a *new* Covenant—and therefore a *better* Covenant—had been distinctly prophesied and promised (7—13).

The superiority of this second Covenant is shown by a comparison of the ministry of the High Priest entering the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement with that of Christ passing into the Heavens. The Levitical High Priest entered the Holiest Place but once a year. He had to do this year after year; he offered for his own sins as well as for those of the people; his sacrifices could not cleanse his conscience; his whole service stood merely in connexion with rites and

ceremonies of a subordinate character. But, on the other hand, Christ (i.) entered, not a symbolic tabernacle, but the Heaven of Heavens; (ii.) He entered it once for all, and for ever; (iii.) He had no need to make any offering for His own sins, being spotless; (iv.) He entered through His own blood, which (v.) was eternally efficacious for the purging of the conscience from dead works; and (vi.) His whole ministration had to do with abiding realities, not with passing shadows (ix. 1—14). Then, led by the double meaning of the word *diathêkê*, which means both "testament" and "covenant," he shows that the blood of Christ was necessary to sanctify the new Covenant, and was efficacious even for the redemption of transgressions under the old (15—22), and that His one Death has wrought an all-sufficient expiation (23—28). He concludes the argument by contrasting the impotence of the Levitic sacrifices to perfect those who offered them—an impotence attested by their incessant repetition—with the one sacrifice offered by the willing obedience of Christ (x. 1—10). Christ's sacrifice issued in His eternal exaltation, after he had perfected the new Covenant in which constant sacrifices are no longer needful, because by the one sacrifice is granted the Forgiveness of Sin (11—18).

Such, in barest outline, is a sketch of the great argument of the Epistle, and we can see at once how powerfully it must have appealed to the intellect and conscience of an enquiring Jew. The sweeping proofs which St. Paul had furnished of the nullity of the Law under the new Christian dispensation, and of the secondary, parenthetic position which it had always occupied in the designs of God, might sway the

reason of a Hebrew reader, but they tended to shock his most cherished prejudices. He would hail an argument which did not involve so apparently absolute a disparagement of the system under which he had been brought up. For, in this new method of Christian argument, even while he enjoyed the glory of the substance he was permitted to admire the beauty of the shadow; he could joyfully see that even in the passing type there had always been a prophecy of the eternal antitype.

Let us now look at this great section in closer detail, and with an effort to understand not only the general bearing of the Epistle, but its separate paragraphs; and let us try in passing to remove any difficulties which may arise from the expressions or the arguments which the writer adopts.

Having spoken of the boldness with which we may approach the Throne of Grace, because of the High Priesthood of Christ, he gives the two conditions of Priesthood, namely, (i.) a power to sympathise, and (ii.) a special call.

(i.) "For every High Priest, being taken[1] from among men, is appointed on behalf of men in things relating to God that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices[2] on behalf of sins,[3] being able to deal compassionately[4] with the ignorant and erring, since he himself also

[1] λαμβανόμενος, "being (as he is) chosen."

[2] This may be one of the writer's sonorous amplifications, for no distinction can here be made between δῶρα and θυσίας. In accurate Greek they differ, and the latter means "slain beasts;" but in the LXX. they are used indiscriminately (παρὰ δὲ τῇ γραφῇ ἀδιαφόρως κεῖνται, Theophylact). The writer may, however, have been thinking of the incense and meat-offerings of the Day of Atonement when he says δῶρα, or of free-will offerings.

[3] ὑπὲρ, *i.e.*, to make atonement for (ii. 17).

[4] Properly, "*to show moderate* emotion." Μετριοπαθὴς was the word

is encompassed with moral weakness; and because of this very weakness[1] he is bound, as for the people so also for himself, to offer sin-offerings[2] (v. 1—3).

(ii.) "And no one takes this honourable office for himself, but on being called by God as even Aaron was.[3] So even the Christ[4] glorified not *Himself* to be made a high priest, but He [glorified Him] who said to Him, Thou art my Son; to-day have I begotten thee.[5] As also in another place He saith, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek;[6]—Who, in the days of his flesh,[7]

used by the Peripatetics, and was invented by Aristotle (Diog. *Laert.* v. 31) to express the right state of mind, as against the Stoics, who demanded of their "sage" a complete suppression of emotion (ἀπαθής). The word is used both by Philo and Josephus of moderating passion Here the context shows that it means "reasonable compassion" (μετριοπαθὴς . . . συγγιγνώσκων ἐπιεικῶς, Hesych.).

[1] δι' αὐτήν (א, A, B, C, D).

[2] See Lev. iv. 3; ix. 7, etc. The first confession of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement was—"O do Thou expiate the misdeeds, the crimes, and the sins wherewith I have done evil and have sinned before Thee, I and my house."

[3] Ex. xxviii. 1; Num. xvi.—xviii.: "God Himself judged Aaron worthy of this honour" (Jos. *Antt.* iii. 8, § 1; and contrast Num. xvi.; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—21). See Bammidbar Rabba, § 18 (in Schöttgen), where Moses brings this fact as a reproach against Korah. The High-priests of the day, when this Epistle was written, were alien Sadducees *not* of high-priestly lineage, who bought and sold, and transferred from one to the other, and generally degraded the office, being originally mere nominees of Herod. They belonged "to certain obscure persons who were only of *priestly* origin," not descendants of Aaron (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 10, § 5). For their characteristics see the Talmudic quotations in my *Life of Christ*, ii. 330, 342, and *infra*, vol. ii. p. 11. But it is doubtful whether the writer means to hint at this state of things. As an Alexandrian, living in Hellenistic communities, it would not be brought prominently under the notice of Apollos, especially as these Boethusim, etc., had now held the office for more than half a century.

[4] The true "anointed Priest."

[5] The Sonship, in the writer's argument, involves the proof of His Divine call to the Priesthood.

[6] "A priest upon his throne" (Zech. vi. 12); κατὰ τάξιν, *al-dibhrathi*, after the office, or place (Ps. cx. 4). The Jews said that the "two anointed ones" ("sons of oil") in Zech. iv. 14 are Aaron and Messiah, and argued from Ps. cx. 4 that Messiah was the dearer to God. They always accounted the Psalm to be Messianic, and the Targum of Jonathan began, "*The Lord said to His Word.*"

[7] σαρκὸς here means His "Humanity."

Having offered up supplications and entreaties to Him who was able to save him out of death, with strong crying and tears,[1] and having been heard because of his reverential awe,[2] Son though He was, learnt his obedience from the things which He suffered,[3] and, after being perfected,[4] became to all those that obey Him the cause of eternal salvation, saluted by God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek[5] (v. 4—10).

"Now, respecting Melchizedek, what we have to say is long, and is difficult to explain to you, since ye have become dull in your hearing.[6] For, indeed, though ye ought to be teachers as far as

[1] Not mentioned in the Gospels in the Agony at Gethsemane, but absolutely implied.

[2] εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας. Ἀπὸ may certainly mean "for," "because of," as in Lk. xix. 3: οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου; xxiv. 41, ἀπιστούντων ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς. Comp. John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14; xxii. 11 (οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης), etc.; Εὐλάβεια (which in the N. T. occurs only at xii. 28) is "reverent fear," as opposed to terror and cowardice. Zeno defined it as "reasonable shrinking" (εὔλογος ἔκκλισις) and as being the opposite of fear, and says that the wise man might εὐλαβεῖσθαι but never φοβεῖσθαι. Demosthenes contrasts the εὐλαβὴς with the δεῖλος. The E. V. is therefore correct, and the meaning of this interesting passage is quite clear. It is a bulwark against the heresies which never will see or allow the perfect *Humanity* of Christ, as well as His true *Divinity*. The attempts to avoid this meaning by rendering it "was heard *by Him whom* He feared" (comp. Gen. xxxi. 42), or "was heard (and so delivered) from that which He feared," are merely due to theological bias. Both renderings are absolutely untenable. The rendering of the E. V. is that of *all the Greek Fathers*, and the meaning of εὐλάβεια excludes every other (see Trench, *New Test. Synonyms*, § x.). The εἰσακουσθεὶς may refer to the Angel who strengthened Him in consequence of His Prayer (Lk. xxii. 43), or to His absolute triumph over death and Hades.

[3] "Son," *i.e.*, not "*a* Son" (for then there would have been no stress on His "learning obedience"), but "*the* Son of God." ἔμαθεν . . . ἔπαθεν, one of the commonest of ancient paronomasias (Herod. i. 207; Æsch. *Ag.* 170; and often in Philo). Theodoret called this expression hyperbolical, and Chrysostom seems surprised by it; and Theophylact goes so far as to call it unreasonable. But "the things that He suffered" have a reference far wider than to the Agony. Still there is no doubt that passages like these increased the hesitancy in receiving the Epistle.

[4] "Perfected" in His *mediatorial* relation, ii. 10.

[5] Comp. Philo, *Opp.* i. 653; ἐν ᾧ (κόσμῳ) καὶ Ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ Λόγος.

[6] This passage also was perhaps known to Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 33).

time is concerned,[1] ye again have need that some one teach you the rudiments[2] of the beginning of the oracles of God, and ye have sunk to the position of those who need milk and not solid food.[3] For every one who feeds on milk is inexperienced in the word of righteousness,[4] for he is an infant. But solid food pertains to the fullgrown—to those who by virtue of their habit have their organs of sense trained to discrimination of good and evil[5] (v. 11—14).

"Leaving, then, the earliest principles of Christian teaching,[6] let us be borne along towards full growth, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works,[7] and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of ablutions[8] and laying on of hands,[9] and of resurrection of the dead, and of æonian judgment.[10] And this let us do if

[1] The expression shows that the Epistle was written somewhat late—to those who had long been converts.

[2] Gal. iv. 3.

[3] 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

[4] Apparently a general phrase for the Gospel. The word *Tsedakah* in Hebrew has a wider range of meaning than "Righteousness."

[5] Clearly not "right and wrong;" but here referring to doctrines—the power to "discriminate the transcendent" (Rom. ii. 18), to distinguish between excellence and inferiority in matter of truth. The phrase is a Hebrew one, *Yada tobh va-râ* (Gen. ii. 17, etc.).

[6] *Leaving* such principles—not, of course, in the sense of neglecting or forgetting them, but in the sense of making an advance beyond them.

[7] Repentance was the *first* and earliest lesson of the Gospel (Mk. i. 15). Dead works—works of the Law (ix. 14; Rom. ix. 32), which have no inherent life in them (*Article XIII.*).

[8] Jewish ablutions (ix. 10) the Jewish converts to Christianity might still retain and explain in a more spiritual sense. *Baptismos* is never used for Christian Baptism (*baptisma*).

[9] For healing (Mk. xvi. 18, etc.), for ordination (Acts vi. 6, etc.), for confirmation (Acts viii. 17, etc.).

[10] The *αἰώνιος* expresses the quality of the *κρῖμα* as referring to the future world. Undoubtedly this sentence is surprising. The *τελειότης* towards which we are to be carried along is evidently connected in the writer's mind with the doctrine of Christ's High Priesthood, as typified by that of Melchizedek. It seems strange that he should rank this Gnosis as so great an advance beyond the doctrines of faith, repentance, and the resurrection, which both St. Paul and we regard as being of such primary importance. See, however, Riehm, *Lehrbegriff der Hebräerbriefs*, 783, f. 9. The writer means, "*These* truths you know, or ought to know, *thoroughly* by this time; but your special danger is apostasy to Judaic formalism, and you would be beyond the reach of this peril if you were capable of grasping the

God permit. For as to those who have been once for all enlightened,[1] and have tasted of the heavenly gift,[2] and become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the excellence of the word of God,[3] and the powers of the Future Age,[4] and who have fallen away[5]—it is impossible again to renew them to repentance, while they are crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh, and putting Him to open shame. For land which has drunk the rain which often cometh upon it, and which is producing herbage suitable for those for whose sake it is also being tilled, partakes of blessing from God; but that which produces thorns and thistles is rejected, and near a curse, the end of which is for burning.[6]

"But, beloved, we are convinced of the better alternative about

truths which I shall now set forth." He does not *disparage* these elementary truths, though they were all *common to Christianity with the older Covenant*.

[1] ἅπαξ is a favourite word of the writer, occurring more frequently in this Epistle than in all the rest of the New Testament. *Photismos* became (probably in consequence of this passage) the regular phrase for baptism (Just. Mart. *Ap.* i. 62; Chrysostom, etc.). Here it has the more general sense.

[2] It is impossible to be certain as to the definite meaning of this expression. It probably means "remission" or "regeneration." It is not easy in this passage to see a clear distinction between γεύσασθαι with the genitive (δωρέας) and the accusative (ῥῆμα).

[3] This phrase is also indefinite, but from a parallel passage of Philo (*De profug.* vi. 25) it probably means the Divine teaching of the Gospel. The writer may here have used the accusative with γεύσασθαι because the genitive would have caused a confusion with Θεοῦ. On the gifts in general comp. ii. 3, 4.

[4] Compare with this expression Philo, *De proem. et poen.* (*Opp.* i. 428, ed. Mangey). "This is he who has *quaffed* much pure wine of God's benevolent power, and *banqueted* upon sacred words and doctrines." The "powers of the future æon" (*i.e.*, of the *Olam habba*) may be foretastes of its glory, or, as Chrysostom says, "the earnest of the spirit."

[5] Comp. ii. 1; iii. 12; x. 26, 29.

[6] vi. 1—8. See *infra*. These strong warnings against apostasy (comp. x. 26—31; xii. 15—17) are a special characteristic of this Epistle. Their general meaning is, that for deliberate and defiant apostasy there is no remedy provided. They are involved in the strong expression of St. Paul, "God is not mocked" (Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται, Gal. vi. 7), and may be compared with Matt. xii. 31, 32, 43—45; 1 John v. 16. It must be borne in mind what a rare insolence and wretchlessness of sin must be involved in such expressions as "trampling down the Son of God" and "insulting the spirit of grace."

you,[1] and things akin to salvation,[2] even though we do thus speak. For God is not unjust to forget in a moment[3] your work and love which ye showed towards His name in having ministered to the saints, and yet ministering.[4] But we long for each of you to show the same earnestness with the view to the full assurance of your hope until the end,[5] that ye may prove yourselves not sluggish,[6] but imitators of those who by faith and patient waiting inherit the promises. [And I say who *inherit* the promises] for God, when He promised to Abraham, since He could not swear by any greater, swore by Himself,[7] saying, Verily,[8] blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, by waiting patiently, he obtained the promises. For men indeed swear by the greater, and to them the oath is an end of all contradiction for confirmation.[9] On which principle,[10] God wishing to show more abundantly[11] to the heirs of the promise the immutability of His purpose, intervened with an oath[12] that by means of two immutable things,[13] in which it is impos-

[1] *τὰ κρείσσονα.* [2] The opposite to *ἐγγὺς κατάρας* in ver. 8.

[3] *ἐπιλαθέσθαι*—forget in a single act. "Labour" (*κόπου*) is omitted in the best MSS., and is probably added from 1 Thess. i. 3.

[4] For the phrase see Rom. xv. 25. The "saints" at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 1) were too poor to minister to others, and this is one indication that the letter was not sent to them.

[5] To show the same earnestness in advancing to perfection as they had shown in ministering to the saints.

[6] That ye may not become as "sluggish" (*νωθροὶ*) in Christian progress as ye *have* become in spiritual knowledge (ver. 11).

[7] In this passage we again find an almost unmistakable reference to Philo, *De Legg. Alleg.* iii. 72: "Having well confirmed His promise even by an oath . . . for thou seest that God sweareth not by another—for nothing is superior to Himself—but by Himself, Who is the best of all."

[8] The MSS. vary between *εἰ μὴ, εἰ μῆν, ἦ μήν*; but the three readings mean much the same. *εἰ μὴ*, a literal rendering of the Hebrew *im lo*, may have led to the variations.

[9] Comp. Philo, *Quod a Deo mittantur somnia* (*Opp.* i. 622), and there are very similar passages in *De Abrahamo* (*Opp.* ii. 39).

[10] *ἐν ᾧ.*

[11] "More abundantly" than if He had not sworn.

[12] Made his oath intermediate between Himself and Abraham. In Berachoth, f. 32, *a*, Moses says to God, "Hadst Thou sworn by Heaven and Earth I should have said *They* will perish, and therefore so may Thy oath; but as Thou hast sworn by Thy great name, that oath shall endure for ever."

[13] Namely, His word and His oath (Gen. xxii. 17). The Targums have not "By Myself," but "By My word have I sworn."

ible for God to lie,[1] we may have a strong encouragement who fled for refuge to grasp the hope set before us.[2] Which we have as an anchor of the soul,[3] secure and firm, and passing to the region behind the veil,[4] where a forerunner on our behalf entered—Jesus—having become a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (vi. 9—20).

The earlier sections of this passage are easy to understand. We see at once that a High Priest who was not of like feelings with ourselves—one who had no capacity for suffering, and therefore no power of sympathy—would be a most imperfect representative of his fellow-men, on whose behalf he has to stand in the presence of God. Nor is it difficult to understand the importance which the writer attaches to a Divine calling to the Priesthood. Of the Divine calling of Christ he furnishes a twofold proof,—the one, that it was involved in the eternal Sonship, which he illustrates by Psalm ii. 7; and the other, that He is addressed as a Priest after the order of Melchizedek in Psalm cx. 4. As both Psalms were fully acknowledged to be Messianic, the cogency of these references would not be disputed. He adds a few words of profound interest to show that Christ's eternal Priesthood was perfected first by the sufferings which He endured for our sakes, and then by His glorification. He regards the whole life of Christ as a part of the work wherein God glorified

[1] "*Nothing* is impossible with God, *except to lie*" (Clem. Rom. 27).

[2] A metonymy for "the object of our Hope set before us as a prize."

[3] In very early times the Anchor was the emblem of Hope. πολλῶν ῥαγεισῶν ἐλπίδων, μιᾶς τυχών (Æsch. *Ag.* 488).

[4] "Nostram ancoram mittimus ad interiora coeli, sicut ancora ferrea mittitur ad inferiora maris." "Christ hath extended to us a Hope from Heaven, as a rope let down from the throne of God, and again reaching from us to the inmost Heaven and the seat of God" (Faber Stapulensis). "The veil," Ex. xxvi. 31—35.

Him to be an Eternal Priest. The main work of that Priesthood was infinite self-sacrifice; for the sake of which, in the days of His flesh, He not only emptied Himself of His glory, but laid aside for a time every claim as the co-eternal and co-equal Son,[1] in order to become a man with men; to dwell in man's house of clay; to have a human soul; to entreat and supplicate and cry to His heavenly Father with tears both in Gethsemane and on the Cross. And He was heard, because of the glory of the infinite self-abnegation involved in this humble awe. In this passage, as elsewhere, the writer furnishes the most inestimable proof that Christ's High Priesthood has the qualification derived from perfect human sympathy. He also gives us a stronghold of assurance to resist that Apollinarian heresy which, with irreverent reverence, denies the true humanity of Christ, and has often been as dangerous to the Church as Arianism itself. Neither that heresy, nor the Monothelite heresy, which denies to our Lord a human will, can find a moment's admission so long as this passage and the early chapters of St. Luke retain their places in Holy Writ. The fact that some of the Fathers were startled by this passage is an additional indication of its importance to the Christian Church. Theodoret ventures to say that since Christ manifested His obedience not *after*, but *before*, His suffering, the expression that "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered" is a hyperbolical expression.[2] Theophylact goes even

[1] Phil. ii. 6: "He counted not equality with God a thing at which to grasp."

[2] The special objection only arose from Theodoret's failure to recognise that the word "suffered" applies not only to the Agony in Gethsemane and on the Cross, but to the whole life of the Saviour.

further, and says that Paul (for he traditionally accepts the Pauline authorship), "for the benefit of his hearers, used such accommodation as obviously to say some unreasonable things."[1] Had these Fathers sufficiently borne in mind that Christ was "perfectly man" as well as "truly God" they would not have used so free a style of criticism. And it might have been better for the Church if they had been less ready to claim a right to use this "accommodation" themselves, and less ready to attribute it to the Apostles.[2]

The digression that follows does not in the least resemble what has been called St. Paul's habit of "going off at a word." This writer does not go off at a word at all. Nothing less resembles being "hurried aside by the violence of his thoughts." His method is precisely the opposite of this. Instead of yielding to the impulse of a strong emotion, as St. Paul does, he prepares himself in the most leisurely and deliberate manner for an argument of consummate skilfulness and power. That argument was wholly original in its development, and he therefore endeavours to stimulate the spiritual dulness of his readers. By a powerful mixture of reproach, warning, and encouragement he arouses them to the moral and intellectual effort without which it is impossible for us to grasp new truth.

He is about to give them not the milk which was necessary for infants—for beginners in Christ's teaching[3]—but solid food, such as was only fitted for mature

[1] See *supra*, p. 375, *note*.

[2] See note on "Accommodation" in my *Mercy and Judgment*, p. 296.

[3] The young Rabbinic neophytes used to be called *thînokôth* (תינוקות), "sucklings." Comp. Philo, *De Agric.*, Ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μὲν ἐστὶ γάλα τροφὴ, κ.τ.λ.

understandings.[1] In their present condition—long as was the time since their conversion—they were incapable of receiving it; but he encourages them to hope that they would become capable, if they were sincere and earnest in their desire for Christian progress. He bids them, therefore, dismiss for the present the subjects which had engaged their attention when they were catechumens. In those days they had been occupied with the initial steps of religious knowledge. It was not his present purpose—it ought to be quite unnecessary now—to remind them once more of such rudimentary truths as the difference between faith and works; the distinction between Jewish ablutions and Christian Baptism; the meaning of imposition of hands; the truths of the resurrection of the body and the sentence of the world to come. They could not need such teachings as this—unless, indeed, they were in danger of apostasy. Of the peril of such apostasy he gives them a most solemn warning.

And here, at once, we find ourselves launched on a sea of controversy which has been age after age renewed. The originality of the writer's mind constantly shows itself in expressions and modes of thought which occur in him alone.

1. First of all the word "enlightened" acquired at a very early age the technical sense of "baptised," so that "enlightenment" (*photismos*)[2] was a recognised synonym of baptism, though it referred directly not

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

[2] The φωτίζεσθαι is equivalent to the "receiving full knowledge of the truth" in x. 26. The word also occurs in 2 Cor. iv. 4, "the illumination of the Gospel of the glory of the Christ." In the LXX. φωτίζειν is "to teach" (Judg. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xii. 2). Similarly in the Fathers ἀνακαινίζειν is "to rebaptise."

to the outward sign, but to the thing signified. Hence the sterner schismatics of the early Church deduced from this passage the duty of finally excluding the weak from Church communion by refusing absolution to those who once had lapsed into apostasy or flagrant sin.[1] This was equivalent to the assertion that "all sin willingly committed after baptism is unpardonable." The fact that the use of "enlightenment" for "baptism" did not exist before this passage was written, but is derived from it, is at once sufficient to set aside the cogency of their inference, which was, it is needless to add, diametrically opposed to the practice and teaching of Christ and His Apostles, and is justly condemned by our Church in her 16th Article.

2. This hard dogma was also rightly rejected by the Fathers, who, following the example of Christ and the Apostles,[2] never closed the door of repentance even to the most flagrant sinners. From this passage, however, they deduced the unlawfulness of administering a second time the rite of Baptism—a right conclusion indeed, but one which rests on other grounds than those which this passage affords.

3. But while these ancient controversies are practically set at rest, we have not yet heard the last of that which raged between Calvinists and Arminians on the "indefectibility of grace."

[1] See Tert. *De pudicit.* 20; Epiphan. *Haer.* lix., μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν μηκέτι ἐλεεῖσθαι δύνασθαι τὸν παραπεπτωκότα; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43; Ambrose, *De Poenit.* ii. 2, &c.; Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. x.; and the Bp. of Winchester on Art. xvi. This attempt to insist upon a transcendental perfection arose from the conviction, held by Montanists, though not by them exclusively, that the end was imminent. The rule of the Novatians was μὴ δέχεσθαι τοὺς ἐπιτεθυκότας εἰς τα μυστήρια (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 28).

[2] 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10; vii. 12.

a. Both sides tampered with the plain meaning of the words. The expression "when they have once fallen away" was fatal to the theories of the Calvinist, who held that those who were regenerate were also elect, and *could never fall away*.[1] It has been often supposed that the rendering of the English Version, "*if* they shall fall away," is an attempt to get rid of this inference. That it is a mistranslation of the most obvious kind is undeniable, since the Greek participle is in the *past* tense; but, if the history of it be traced through various versions of the Bible, it seems not to have been due to a Calvinistic bias, but to be a perfectly honest mistake, derived from other sources. Calvin himself was far too great a scholar to defend his view by such a rendering. He adopted the different method of attempting to weaken the force of the previous expressions, and to argue that when the writer spoke of those "who tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the future world," he did not mean "true and sincere believers," but only "the reprobates who had but *tasted, as it were, with their outer lips* the grace of God, and been irradiated by some sparks of His Light." He tried, in fact, to exaggerate the literal meaning of the word "taste," so as to imply that it meant nothing more than an *inkling* of Christian truth. It will be seen at once that such an argument is not to explain Scripture,

[1] The reader will be reminded of what was said by the dying Cromwell. He asked his chaplain a question as to "the indefectibility of grace." "Was it possible for any one who had once been in a state of grace to fall away from it?" When his chaplain answered in the negative Cromwell replied that in that case he was happy, for he felt sure that once he had been in a state of grace.

but to explain it away. Extravagant literalism has been even more fatal to exegesis than extravagant allegorising.

β. But the Calvinists had no monopoly in the distortion of the plain meaning of the sacred words. That error belongs, alas! to all sects and all religious partisans alike. Arminians, who were unwilling to admit that in this life the door of repentance and of hope could ever be closed to any sinner, stumbled at the word "impossible," and actually rendered it (as in some ancient Latin manuscripts) by the word *difficile*, "difficult." The doctrine on behalf of which they thus twisted words to suit their own meaning may, indeed, be amply supported, but it must not be supported by such an untenable procedure. "Impossible" has a very different meaning from "difficult," and it is clear that the writer lays down quite distinctly that, when those who have received spiritual illumination and shared in Divine gifts deliberately apostatise, it is *impossible* to renew them to repentance, seeing that they are—or, as the words may perhaps be rendered, *so long as* they are—crucifying afresh, to their own ruin, the Son of God. He does not say that this *has* occurred in the case of the Hebrew Christians; nay, he expresses his conviction that it has not. He does not even say that it *can* occur. He only says that, *when it occurs, and so long as it lasts* renewal is impossible. There can be no *second* "Second Birth."

4. On the other hand, his words must not be forced and tortured into conclusions which do not fall within the scope either of his language or of his hypothesis. All that he has here in view is the agency of men—the teaching and ministry of the Church; he is neither

speaking nor thinking of the omnipotence of God. It is impossible in the highest degree for a camel to go through the eye of a needle;[1] but what is impossible with men is possible with God.[2] And, indeed, the marked change of tenses in this passage is not without its significance. He says that it is impossible to renew to repentance those who *have* fallen away, *crucifying as they are* the Son of God. The change from the past to the present implies a continuous, as well as an insolent apostasy. It implies the case of those who cling deliberately to their sins.[3] While this continues, how can there be any hope of renewal? The condition of such men, as long as it continues unchanged, precludes all possibility of the action of grace. It is impossible at once "to be pardoned" and to retain the offence. If, said the Jewish Rabbis, a man has merely touched a creeping thing, the smallest drop of water suffices for his Levitic purification; but if he keeps the unclean thing purposely in his hand, an ocean of ablutions will not make him clean. It is impossible to save willing offenders in the sense in which *man* may "save" his brother (1 Tim. iv. 16); but nothing is impossible to God.

5. It will be seen, then, how little this passage lends itself to the violent oppositions of these old controversies. Nor, again, has it much bearing on the too curious speculations in which some have indulged about the

1 Matt. xix. 26; Mk. x. 27; Lk. xviii. 27. That the words must be understood in their literal sense, and that neither can κάμηλος mean "rope," nor "the eye of a needle" mean "the side-gate of a city," I have shown in a paper in the *Expositor* (Vol. iii. 169).

2 So St. Ambrose (*De poenit.* ii. 3): "Quae impossibilia sunt apud homines, possibilia sunt apud Deum, et potens est Deus quando vult donare nobis peccata, etiam quae putamus non posse concedi."

3 ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτανόντων x. 26.

sin against the Holy Ghost, and the unpardonable sin.[1] That there is a sin which shall not be forgiven, either in this or the future age—that there is "a sin unto death," for the forgiveness of which we are not bidden to pray—that the last state of a backslider or an apostate may be worse than the first[2]—we learn from other passages of Scripture. That a daring and willing apostasy—a deliberate return from light to darkness, and from the power of God to Satan—must be the most perilous of all conditions, and therefore must very nearly approach to those awful sins, is clear from the nature of the case, since like "the doing despite to the spirit of grace" (x. 29) it seems to close against itself the very door of salvation.[3] We must neither turn the text into "a rack of despair" nor into "a pillar of carnal security." If by the expression "on their falling away" he meant to describe *every* fall into mortal sin, then, as Luther says, his words would contradict "all the Gospels, and all the Epistles of St. Paul." But he is speaking only of predetermined and wilful apostasy, and irrevocable Divine dereliction;[4] such as is described in that passage of Isaiah[5] where the Prophet speaks of renegades passing through the land hardly

[1] See *infra* on 1 John v. 16.

[2] 2 Pet. ii. 20; Lk. xi. 26.

[3] A writer who was not thinking of the Epistle to the Hebrews has said, in touching only one little aspect of the consequences of apostasy, that "When the Christian falls back out of the bright hope of the Resurrection, even the Orpheus song is forbidden him; not to have known the hope is blameless: one may sing, unknowing, as the swan or Philomela. But to have known and fall away from it, and to declare that the human wishes which are summed in that one—'Thy kingdom come'—are vain! The Fates ordain that there shall be no singing after that."—Ruskin, "Fiction, Fair and Foul" (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug. 1880).

[4] Von Oettingen and Delitzsch refer to the case of Spira (see Herzog. *Real. Encykl.*, *s. v.*).

[5] Is. viii. 21.

bestead, and hungry, and fretting themselves, and looking upwards only to curse their King and their God, and seeing nothing but dimness and anguish when they look downwards. Beyond this we cannot go. The various modern discussions which have risen out of these mysterious passages do not seem to have been consciously present to the writer's mind. He is speaking to a very different class from those whom Christ warned about the sin against the Holy Ghost. He is speaking to Hebrew Christians, and pointing out to them with awful faithfulness the fact that they were becoming spiritually stagnant, and that stagnancy ends in corruption. To return to their dead works after the heavenly enlightenment—to abandon the eternal substance for the transient shadow—to go back from the finished sacrifice of Christ to the beggarly elements of the Law, was a peril which they were beginning to incur, but from which he felt convinced that they would be saved in time. Nor could he have chosen any words better fitted than these to arrest the degeneracy which he already saw and deplored.

A less voluminous controversy has arisen out of the writer's comparison of the backsliding, or rather the apostate, Christians to waste and worthless land.

a. The test of sincerity is fruitfulness. The field that has drunk the rain from heaven, and bears thirty, sixty, or a hundredfold, is a field which God has blessed. But the field on which the rain falls and the sun shines in vain, and which only brings forth weeds wherewith the mower filleth not his hand, nor he that gathereth the sheaves his bosom, has been tested and found profitless, like the clay ground between Succoth and Zeredatha.[1] Of such

[1] 2 Chron. iv. 17.

land he says that it is "nigh to a curse." Doubtless he has in mind the older curse—which yet the mercy of God mitigated into something not far from a blessing—"Cursed is the ground for thy sake. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee."[1] But yet the form of his expression surely shows how far are his thoughts from the awful dogma of final reprobation. "See," says St. Chrysostom, "how much consolation his words involve! He says '*near* a curse,' not '*a curse.*' But he who has not yet fallen into a curse, but has got *near* it, will also be able to get afar from it. If then we cut out and burn up the thorns, we shall be able to enjoy the unnumbered benefits, and to become approved, and to share in the blessing."

β. Yet *the end* of such waste soil is "for burning." Some have thought that even in this burning there is implied, not hopeless destruction, but a method of improvement. Such a method was well known to Roman agriculture. "Often, too," says Virgil, "hath it been of use to fire barren fields, and to burn the light stubble with crackling flames; whether it be that so the lands acquire hidden strength and fattening nurture, or that so every distemper is baked out of them by fire, and the useless moisture sweats out, or that the heat opens out more paths and secret apertures through which sap may come to the tender plants."[2] It may be doubted whether the writer was familiar with this agricultural practice, or its supposed utility. It is more likely that he was thinking of scorched and waste wildernesses like that "Burnt Phrygia" with which he must have been familiar, or of regions like the Solfatara, or

[1] Gen. iii. 18.
[2] Virg. *Georg.* i. 84, *seq.* See, too, Plin. *H. N.* xviii. 39, 72.

of the smoke rising from the fields of Sodom, where "the whole land is brimstone and salt, and burning, that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any green groweth therein."[1] He is not describing the actual fate in store for any of his readers; he is illustrating by a passing metaphor the ultimate destiny of those who deliberately reject God—of those who, having sinned willingly against light and knowledge, continue hardened in defiant impenitence. Such, for instance, would be the position of those Jews who, having once known Christ, so far apostatised from Him as to adopt the current names of scorn by which He was described in the Jewish cryptographs—to speak of Him as "Absalom" or "the Hung," or to turn the form of His name into an anagram of malediction.[2] If the ground which God gives us to till produces only thorns and thistles, we must, as St. Chrysostom says, cut up and burn them. We must "break up our fallow ground, and not sow among thorns."[3] We shall then be able "to enjoy unnumbered blessings and to become approved." The evil produce of the soil must be consumed that the soil may be saved for better purposes, just as the bad work of a workman must be burned while the workman shall be saved so as by fire. But if the work of the workman be always and continuously bad, he is rejected; and if a soil brings forth nothing but things rank and gross in nature, it must itself be scathed with fire. The metaphor acquires a fuller significance if we think of the Jews to whom it was addressed, and remember that, but a few years afterwards, their beloved city was

[1] Deut. xxxix. 23.
[2] See *Life of Christ*, ii. 452. [By *notarikon*, *Jemach Shemo Vezichro*, "May his name and memory be blotted out."]
[3] Jer. iv. 3.

trodden under foot by its enemies, and their Holy Temple was given to the devouring flame.

But he proceeds to tell them that he has a conviction that they, his Christian readers, have adopted the better course, and will inherit the better lot. He did not doubt that they were heirs of salvation, though he used this language. "Their work, their alms, and all their good endeavours" furnished a proof of this; for God is just, and God does not forget. They had ministered to the saints; they were still doing so, though, perhaps—as he seems to hint with delicate kindness—with less zeal than before. He exhorts them not to show themselves remiss, but with all zeal to work out their salvation to the end, and so by faith and endurance to enter into that heritage which was pledged to them not only by the word but by the oath of God. However severe, therefore, their afflictions had been, they might rest upon a sure hope. The little boat of their lives was being tossed by many a storm, yet it was safe, for it was moored by an anchor which could never slip its hold. That anchor was not fixed even on the rock of any earthly sea, but the hawser which held it passed out of sight behind the veil of Heaven; and in that heavenly sanctuary ONE had entered as a forerunner on their behalf. HE would see that the anchor held; He would keep guard over the promised hope,—the High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

SECTION IV.

THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK.

In those words the writer, with great literary skill, resumes the allusion which he had introduced in v. 10,

and had left unexplained in order to prepare them for his argument by the exhortation of these intermediate verses. But now that he has stimulated them to a loftier range of spiritual attainments by warning them of the peril of apostasy, and by encouraging them to perseverance in good works, he can proceed with a surer step to develop the truths which were best fitted to emancipate them from their temptation to relapse.

"For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God most high,[1] who met[2] Abraham returning from the slaughter[3] of the kings and blessed him,[4] to whom also Abraham apportioned a tithe of all,[5] being first by interpretation King of righteousness,[6] and then also King of Salem, which is King of peace; without father, without mother, without lineage,[7] having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but having been likened to the Son of God[8] remaineth a Priest for perpetuity" (vii. 1—3).

This comparison of the Priesthood of Christ to that of Melchizedek occupies so cardinal a position, that we must pause over this passage if we are to form any true conception of the meaning of the Epistle.

[1] King and Priest, Zech. vi. 13 (Serv. *ad Æn.* iii. 80). See the subsequent remarks for further notes on this passage.

[2] The true reading is ὅς, not ὁ (ℵ, A, B, D, E, K). The construction is an anakoluthon.

[3] κοπὴ, from κόπτω, "I cut." Comp. Josh. x. 20 (LXX.).

[4] Philo (*De Abraham*, § 40) says that Melchizedek "sacrificed for Abraham the offerings of victory."

[5] *I.e.*, of all his spoils.

[6] V. *infra*.

[7] Ἀγενεαλόγητος, which occurs here only, cannot mean "without *descent*" (see ver. 6), though, misled by this error, Ignatius (*Ep. ad Philad.*) reckons Melchizedek among those who have led a celibate life.

[8] This expression not only refers to Ps. cx. 4, but speaks of Melchizedek as a Divinely appointed type of Priesthood, which he is not recorded to have either received from any ancestors, or transmitted to any successors.

Let us first endeavour to clear up the separate expressions.

All that we know historically respecting Melchizedek is contained in two verses in the Book of Genesis (Gen. xiv. 18, 19).

We are there told that when Amraphel, king of Shinar, with three allies made war on Bera, king of Sodom, and his four allies, and defeated them, they carried away the plunder and captives of the Cities of the Plain. Among these captives was Lot, whose goods they had also seized. Abraham, arming his three hundred and eighteen servants, and assisted by the Amorite chiefs Mamre, Aner, and Eshcol, pursued the victors to the neighbourhood of Damascus, defeated them, rescued their prisoners, and recovered the spoil. On his return the king of Sodom went out to thank and greet him, and met him "at the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale." "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God.[1] And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all."

If we first take the narrative as it stands, we observe that it is not stated that Melchizedek went out to meet Abraham, as it is stated of the king of Sodom. It is, however, a natural inference that he did so, and we see from the reference of the writer of the Epistle that such was part of the Jewish tradition on the sub-

[1] The union of Royalty and Priesthood was regarded as peculiarly sacred. "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos" (Virg. *Æn.* iii. 80).

ject. The place of meeting is uncertain. Shaveh has never been identified, nor is anything known of the King's dale.[1] The name Melchizedek may mean "king of righteousness"—a rendering found in the Targums,[2] and here introduced perhaps with reference to Is. xxxii. 1, where it is said of the Messiah, "Behold a king shall reign in righteousness."[3] It may also mean "righteous king," as it is rendered in Josephus[4] and Philo.[5] It is a name closely analogous to Adonizedek, which means "Lord of righteousness" or "justice," and is a natural name for an Eastern king whose chief function in time of peace was that of a judge. Adonizedek is called king of Jerusalem,[6] but Melchizedek is called king of Salem. It has been a disputed point for centuries whether by Salem is meant Jerusalem or not.[7]

That this king of a Canaanite city should be "a priest of the most high God" is an interesting circumstance. Attempts have been made to explain it away. The Hebrew phrase for the most high God is *El Elión*, and it appears that the Phœnicians also had a god to whom they gave the title of Eliôn, or The

[1] Josephus calls it πεδίον βασιλικόν (*Antt.* i. 10, § 2). There is nothing to identify it with "the King's dale" in which Absalom built himself a pillar. Even if it be the same "King's dale" it *may* have been in the tribe of Ephraim, if the reading of 2 Sam. xiii. 23 be right; but there, instead of "beside Ephraim," there is a various reading, "the Valley of Rephaim."

[2] In Bereshith Rabba, f. 42, *a*, it is said that *Tsedek* was a name of Jerusalem, as is implied in Is. i. 21. "Righteousness lodged in it." Aben Ezra makes Melchizedek mean "King of a righteous place."

[3] Compare Is. ix. 6; Zech. ix. 9; Mal. iv. 2; 1 Cor. i. 30.

[4] *Antt.* i. 10, § 2; *B. J.* vi. 10; ὁ τῇ πατρίᾳ γλώσσῃ κληθεὶς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος.

[5] *Leg. Allegg.* iii. 25.

[6] Josh. x. 3.

[7] See Excursus X., "'Salem' and Jerusalem."

Highest.[1] Nothing, however, can be clearer than that Moses intended the word to be understood in its fullest sense of the True God.[2] Nor is there any excuse for being incredulous about the fact, for, when we remember the longevity of the patriarchs, it is probable that the worship of God would have been preserved in some families. And the *primary* intention of the sacred historian in mentioning this incident may have been a desire to do honour to this kingly priest, whose dignity was recognised with such deep reverence by Abraham himself, that he accepted his solemn blessing, and gave him a tithe of his spoils.

It was natural that a circumstance so remarkable should attract the attention of the Jews, and that they should see something memorable in the priesthood of a king who enjoyed his sacerdotal dignity so many centuries before the days of Aaron, and who had been treated with so much honour by their great ancestor himself. Hence it was also natural that the Hebrew poet in the 110th Psalm,[3] in prophesying of a Prince and Deliverer who was the type of the Messiah, should say, "The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." The Messianic interpretation of this Psalm was never disputed.[4] If it had been, nothing would

[1] Philo Bybl. *ap.* Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* i. 10. A trace of this title (*alonim walonuth*=Elionim velionoth) is perhaps discoverable in the Poenulus of Plautus.

[2] Though this is the earliest occurrence of the name, it is found frequently in the Pentateuch and Psalms. Abram repeats it with "Jehovah" in ver. 22.

[3] In the title, Ps. cx. is called "A Psalm of David;" the LXX. call it "An ode to the Assyrian."

[4] Comp. Zech. vi. 13, where, of the High Priest Joshua (Jeshua in Ezra and Neh.) as a type of the Messiah, it is said, "He shall be," or perhaps "There shall be," "a priest upon his throne."

have been easier for the Jews than to set aside the question about David's son and David's Lord which our Lord propounded to them, and which they expressed their inability to solve.[1] But even the Targum of Jonathan renders the first verse of this Psalm by "The Lord said to His Word."

But when Melchizedek was thus elevated into a type of the Messiah, the brief notice respecting him was studied with the minutest scrutiny, and mysteries were supposed to lurk in every word. Thus so simple a circumstance as his bringing forth to Abraham bread and wine is in Bereshith Rabba explained by Rabbi Samuel Bar Nachman to mean that he taught to Abraham the ordinances of the High Priesthood, the bread being a type of the shewbread, and the wine of libations. Other Rabbis, referring to Prov. ix. 5—"Come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled"—say that Melchizedek explained the Law to Abraham. These it is obvious are mere fancies of a fantastic exegesis bent on seizing every opportunity to proclaim the eternity of the Levitic dispensation. Yet multitudes of Christian writers, imbued with the spirit which *will* see in Scripture more than Scripture sanctions, make this simple act of hospitality a sacerdotal oblation, and argue (with Bellarmine) that it was the one characteristic of his Priesthood.[2] But that the bread and wine were not typically intended is clear from the silence of the Epistle. Had the application been legitimate, a point so germane to the writer's pur-

[1] Matt. xxii. 44.

[2] On this perversion see Waterland, *Works*, v. 165; Jewel, *Reply to Harding, art.* xvii.; and on the other side, Jackson, *On the Creed*, ix., § ii. 10.

those could not have been passed over without notice, especially as Philo, who has very similar views respecting Melchizedek, ventures to say that on this occasion he did offer a sacrifice for victory—ἐπινίκια ἔθυε.[1] What an opportunity for powerful argument would have been furnished if Apollos could have said that Melchizedek's sacrifice was not an offering of victims in the Jewish fashion, but was an offering which prefigured the Christian oblations of bread and wine! Of such a sacrifice he does not say a word. Whatever may have been the acts in which the priesthood of Melchizedek consisted, Apollos does not mention sacrifice among them. He does not so much as allude to the bread and wine—much less does he imply that it was an Eucharistic offering.

But he touches on other points which seem to enhance the dignity or mysteriousness of Melchizedek by saying that he was "fatherless, motherless, without pedigree, having neither beginning of days nor end of life."

His method of illustration, like that of which St. Paul occasionally made use, is Rabbinic in its general character, but not fantastic or inadmissible. He takes a Scriptural fact as it stands, and merely shows its typical value. It is, however, this passage which has originated so many untenable conjectures about Melchizedek, and which has been made an excuse for most strange hypotheses. Such discussions would never have arisen if we had been more familiar with the way of handling Scripture which had become prevalent at Alexandria, and was perpetuated for centuries in the later schools of Tiberias and Babylon.

[1] *De Abraham.*

Of course, if the words be taken literally they can have but one meaning. One who had neither father, nor mother, nor ancestors, neither beginning of days nor end of life, could not be a human being at all. Accordingly Melchizedek has been regarded by some commentators, even of this century, as "the Angel of the Presence," the "Captain of the Lord's Host," "the Divine Angel of the Lord," the Second Person of the Ever Blessed Trinity, the Jewish "Shechinah" and Metatron,[1] who continually appeared to the Fathers under the Old Testament dispensation. Cunæus even refers to this incident in explanation of our Lord's words to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." Marcus Eremita mentions a sect which believed Melchizedek to be "God the Word, previous to incarnation."[2]

Others, again, thought that Melchizedek was the Holy Spirit.[3] This was the opinion maintained in an anonymous work—probably written by the deacon Hilarius—which St. Jerome received from Evagrius, and which led him to an elaborate study of what had been written on this question, which even in his day was eagerly debated. He found that Origen and Didymus believed Melchizedek to be an angel, and that the

[1] Metatron is a Talmudic word of foreign origin, perhaps a rude hybrid of μετὰ θρόνιος, or "sharer of the Throne." He was the chief of the four Angels who were "Masters of Wisdom." He stands in a subordinate relation to God, but to him are attributed many of the works of the "Angel of the Presence,"—a sort of Pre-incarnate Messiah (see Hamburger, *s. v.*).

[2] Epiphan. *Haer.* lv. 7; Ambrose, *De Abraham.* i. 3. All these opinions and quotations are diligently collected by Bleek.

[3] Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvii. 3. This wild theory was maintained by the sect of Melchizedekites (see Dorner, i. 515).

Jews supposed him to be Shem, the son of Noah,[1] who —as they showed by calculation—might have survived till the days of Abraham.[2] It is hard to see why, in that case, he should not have been introduced by his own name. Yet this hypothesis satisfied Lyra, Cajetan, Melancthon, and even Luther and Selden. Others again, with about as much justification, suppose that he was Ham. Calmet regards him as a re-appearance of Enoch. Nork, with hardly less absurdity, discovers in him the Phœnician god Sydik, or Saturn ![3]

I unhesitatingly follow those who reject these idle hypotheses, and who hold with Hippolytus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and other Fathers, as well as the ablest recent commentators, that Melchizedek was neither more nor less than what Moses tells us that he was—namely, Melchizedek, a Priest and King of the little Canaanite town of Salem, to whom, because he was a worshipper of the True God, Abraham paid tithes, and from whom he received a blessing.[4] His importance was purely typical; his *personal* importance was very small. It is amazing that any one familiar with Rabbinic exegesis should hesitate for a moment in coming

[1] Rabbi Jochanan Ben Nuri says: "The Holy One—blessed be He!—took Shem, and separated him to be a priest to Himself, that he might serve before Him. He also caused His Shechinah to rest with him, and called his name Melchizedek, Priest of the Most High, and King of Salem."—*[illegible]uth Hakkodesh*, Pt. iii. c. 20; *Nedarim*, f. 32, *b*.

[2] Thus in two of the Targums—though *not* in that of Onkelos—we find the gloss "Malka Zedika, who was Shem bar Noah." But as far as the Epistle to the Hebrews is concerned, it is enough to say that (1) Shem is *not* ἀγενεαλόγητος: his lineage is recorded; (2) that Canaan was in the territory of Ham (see Deyling, *Obs. Sacr.* ii. 73; Bochart, *Phaleg.* ii. 1; Jackson, *On the Creed*, Bk. ix.). This opinion of the Jews, though embraced by Luther, Lightfoot, &c., seems to have been post-Christian.

[3] Nork, *Bibl. Mythol.* i. 154.

[4] See Cave, *Lives of the Apostles*, xxii. This is the view of Josephus (*B. J.* vi. 10).

to this conclusion. In the Alexandrian School especially, the habit of allegorising had been carried so far as to imperil, and even obliterate, the plain sense of the sacred narrative. The allegorists saw or imagined mysteries in the silence of Scripture no less than in its simplest circumstances, and even in the numerical values and methods of writing its letters. The writer of this Epistle, familiar with the works of Philo, adopts the Alexandrian method in arguing with those by whom it would be regarded as specially cogent. But he neither abuses the method nor carries it to untenable extremes. He sees that the suddenness with which Melchizedek is introduced into the sacred story, and the subsequent silence respecting him, are reasons for regarding him as a Divinely-appointed *type* of the Messiah. The Book of Genesis, as Bishop Wordsworth says, casts on him a shadow of eternity; gives him a typical eternity. But he expressly treats of him as a type, and a *type only*, of One whose "office was incomparably beyond that of the legal Economy"—his person greater, his undertaking weightier, his design more sublime and excellent, his oblation more meritorious, his prayers more prevalent, his office more durable than even any whose business it was to intercede and mediate between God and man.[1] Had Melchizedek been the Metatron, or the Pre-incarnate Messiah, he would *not* have been a type, but the Divine Son Himself; he would not have been *likened to* Christ, but would have *been* Christ. All the conjectures respecting him were excusable in times when the peculiarities of Semitic thought were little known; but now that the history of exegesis is better under-

[1] Cave, *l. c.*

stood, such suggestions can only be ranked among obsolete mistakes.

For there are abundant instances to prove that such phrases as "fatherless, motherless, without pedigree," were used, not only in Rabbinic Hebrew, but even in Classical Greek and in Latin, of those whose parents and ancestry were simply *unrecorded.* Thus Ion, in the tragedy of Euripides, calls himself "motherless" when he supposes himself to be the son of a slave-woman;[1] and Scipio addressed the mongrel crowd in the Forum as people "who had neither father nor mother;"[2] and Horace speaks of himself as "sprung from *no* ancestors."[3] Similarly we find in Bereshith Rabba that "a Gentile has no father,"[4] *i.e.*, the father of a proselyte is of no account in Jewish pedigrees. The Jewish priests were obliged to keep the most careful genealogies, and some families were for ever excluded from the priesthood in Ezra's days because they could not produce adequate proof of their priestly descent.[5] And not only must they be able to produce the names of their fathers and their ancestry up to Aaron, but, further, their marriages were regulated by the most rigid restrictions.[6] It was remarkable to the Jews of Ezra's day that Melchizedek should be introduced *as a priest*—and as a priest of such striking dignity—while not a word is said of his father or mother, or ancestors, or birth, or death.[7] In the mystic treatment

[1] *Ion*, 850.
[2] Cic. *de Orat.* ii. 64.
[3] Hor. *Sat.* i. 6. 10.
[4] f. 18, *b*.
[5] Ezr. ii. 61, 62; Nehem. vii. 63, 64.
[6] Lev. xxi. 7, 13, 14.
[7] "The Melchizedek of human history has, indeed, died; but the Melchizedek of sacred history lives without dying, fixed for ever *as one who lives* by the pen of the sacred historian, and thus stamped as a type of

of Scripture by the Talmudists, arguments are drawn from this silence. Thus, from the non-mention of Cain's death in Scripture Philo draws the lesson that evil never dies among the human race. The very vagueness in which this grand figure of Melchizedek is left, although he is the first who in Scripture is called a priest, makes him better suited to stand as the type of one who was endowed with an eternal priesthood. The words of the writer taken literally are applicable to Jesus alone,[1] and are only applicable to Melchizedek in the secondary and metaphorical sense which I have explained. He stands on the page of Scripture as an eternal priest, because Scripture witnesses alike to his priesthood and his life without an allusion to the abrogation of the one or the close of the other.[2] If any harshness still remains, it is removed by the consideration that in the mind of the writer the type and the antitype are so simultaneously prominent that the language which refers to the one is mingled with that which is more strictly

the Son, the ever-living Priest" (Delitzsch). "He is simply an *otherwise unknown* king, whose meeting with Abraham is, however, in the history of redemption, of the greatest historical and typical importance" (Moll).

[1] The word "without mother" might seem inapplicable, and would be inapplicable if the Church had ever sanctioned the title *Theotokos* applied to the Virgin Mary; but, as Theodoret rightly observes, "as God, He has been begotten of the Father alone."

[2] Alford thinks it "*almost childish*" to suppose that the writer meant no more than that the life, death, etc., of Melchizedek are not recorded; and therefore he regards him as a Divine being about whom we are not to be wise above what is written, and about whom we are not called upon to enquire further! It is not "almost," but "quite" childish to pretend to interpret Scripture by ignoring the plain peculiarities of the language and method of thought among those by whom it was written. And the misapplied text about "not being wise above what is written" is usually degraded into an excuse for *being* wise above what is written—to the extent, sometimes, of utter superstition.

applicable to the other. To ignore these facts, and to regard Melchizedek as a Divine being, still alive as a priest, though he only occurs in a single clause of a simple historic narrative,[1] is to apply to Scripture the methods of explanation which reduce it to an insoluble enigma, and which subject the souls of unbiassed readers to a strain which it was never intended that they should bear. Any one who helps to rescue the Holy Book from these extravagancies of superstitious letter-worship renders to faith a service for which he may be rebuked by contemporary ignorance, but which will bear good fruit in future times.

"But observe,"[2] he continues, "how great was this man to whom even Abraham gave a tithe out of his best spoils[3]—he, the patriarch.[4] And those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly function,[5] have commandment to tithe the people according to the law[6]—that is, their brethren, sprung though they are from the

[1] Josephus simply calls him "a chief of the Canaanites."

[2] The proper difference between ὁρῶ, "I see," and θεωρῶ, "I observe" (though it is not always kept in common usage), is given by Phavorinus, who says that ὁρῶ is applied to bodily, and θεωρῶ to spiritual, insight.

[3] ἀκροθίνια, derived from ἄκρος and θίς, properly means "what is taken from the top of the heap," but it is used for "the firstfruits of spoils" and sometimes, apparently (according to Hesychius and Phavorinus), for "spoils" generally.

[4] The position of ὁ πᾰτρῐᾱρχῆς is very forcible, and the oratorical style of the writer evidently makes him fond of these sounding collocations. The use of the Ionicus a minore (˘ ˘ ¯ ¯) to end the sentence makes the word still more prominent. A whole argument about the grandeur of Abraham is thus condensed into one emphatic word. (Comp. Acts vii. 16, 43; xxviii. 31; Gal. iii. 1.)

[5] Aristotle defines this word ἱερατεία as meaning "the care concerning the gods" (*Pol.* vii. 8). It seems to be a little more specific than ἱερωσύνη.

[6] A needless difficulty has been made of this expression because the Priests did not directly receive tithes from the people, but only from the Levites, who paid them a tithe of what they received as tithes (Numb. xviii. 22, 23, 26; Neh. x. 38). Hence Biesenthal proposes to read Λευΐν for λαόν. But (*a*) the Priests *might* take these tithes directly, as Jewish tradition said that they did in the days of Ezra (Yevamoth, f. 86, *b*;

loins of Abraham: but he whose descent is not derived from them hath tithed Abraham, and hath blessed[1] the holder of the promises. Now, beyond all dispute, that which is inferior is ever blessed by the superior. And in this case dying men[2] receive tithes; but in *that* case he of whom it is testified that he lives.[3] And, so to speak, by means of Abraham, even Levi, who receiveth tithes, hath been tithed; for he was still in the loins of his father when Abraham met him" (vii. 4—10).

The argument of this passage is the superiority of Melchizedek's priesthood to that of Aaron in seven particulars:—

(i.) Because even Abraham gave him tithes.

Bechoroth, f. 4, *a*); and (β) the expression is a general one—"*qui facit per alium, facit per se.*" The question, as Dr. Moulton says, is not one of emolument, but of position, and the Priests stood alone in receiving tithes and paying none.

[1] The perfects express the absolute and permanent fact.

[2] *I.e.*, men under the liability to die, as in the well-known lines—

"He preached as one who ne'er should preach again,
And as a dying man to dying men."

[3] We know nothing of the death of Melchizedek: so far, therefore, as the page of Scripture is concerned, he always lives. The argument is analogous to that which I have already mentioned, derived by Philo from the absence of any mention of the death of Cain in Scripture. To a writer addressing those who in the Rabbinic *Midrashim* heard daily specimens of similar applications, nothing would be more natural than to argue that the absence of all mention of the death of Melchizedek made him, in yet another respect, an eternal type of Christ. The difference between his method and ours is not in the *point of view*, but only in *the method of statement.* Writing in these days we might argue thus: The Psalmist says that God had sworn that the Priest-king, the Messiah of whom he is prophesying, should be "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." We learn from the Book of Genesis that the Priesthood of Melchizedek was one of such high dignity as to be recognised even by the Patriarch Abraham; and in this respect, as well as in its magnificent and untransmitted independence, it is evidently spoken of as superior to the Aaronic Priesthood. And it is also a type of the Messianic Priesthood, because just as Christ was eternal and superior to all earthly relationships, so on the page of Scripture Melchizedek stands without father, mother, or descent, and with no record of human birth or human death. This is all condensed by the writer of the Epistle into such expressions as those in the text.

(ii.) Because even the yet-unborn Levi may be said to have paid tithes in the person of Abraham.

(iii.) Because it is the superior who gives the blessing, and Melchizedek blessed Abraham.

(iv.) Because the Aaronic priests die, but Melchizedek stands as a type of undying priesthood.

(v.) Because the permanence of his Priesthood implied the abrogation of the whole Law on which the Levitic Priesthood was grounded.

If there was a transference of the Priesthood there was necessarily also a transference of the Law. Had there been in the Levitic Law any power of perfectionment, what need would there have been for a different priest[1] to rise of whom it was expressly said, not that he was "after the order of Aaron," but that he was "after the order of Melchizedek"? And "our Lord,"[2] in whom was fulfilled the Type of Eternal Priesthood, *was a different* Priest, seeing that He has sprung[3] from a different tribe than that of the Aaronic priests—namely, the royal but non-priestly tribe of Judah.[4] Christ is a Priest, not in accordance with

[1] ἕτερον, "a different," not merely ἄλλον, "another."

[2] This passage is memorable as being the *first* in which this expression—now so familiar and universal—is applied to Christ. It marks an advance in the growth of Christianity.

[3] ἀνατέταλκεν, a word almost invariably used of the sunrise (Mal. iv. 2; Is. lx. 1; Lk. xii. 54; 2 Pet. i. 19), though also of the springing of plants (Zech. iii. 1; vi. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5, where the LXX. render "the Branch" by Ἀνατολή; and Is. xliv. 4; Ezek. xvii. 6).

[4] The writer does not touch on the doubt which hung over the High Priesthood of his time. If his readers were Palestinian Jews, *they* at least, and probably all Jews, would be quick to catch the fresh force which was added to his arguments by this circumstance. Those Sadducean hierarchs had been introduced by Herod. They were of priestly, but it was far from certain that they were of high-priestly, descent (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 10; xv. 3, § 1). Philo, who was himself of Aaronic descent, uses the expression ἀρχιερεὺς ψευδώνυμος (*Opp.* ii. 246, Mangey).

"the law of a fleshen commandment"—*i.e.*, with the transitory system which was hedged round with the limitations of earthly relationships[1]—but in accordance with the power of that indissoluble life[2] which is indicated by the swearing of the oaths that He should be "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." From the change, then, of the Priesthood we infer nothing less than the disannulment of the preceding commandment[3] because of its weakness and unprofit-

[1] Neither this writer nor St. Paul would have called the Law "carnal" (σαρκικὸς), a term which he expressly disclaims (Rom. vii. 14). The true reading is σαρκίνης (א, A, B, C, D, etc.; 1 Cor. iii. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 3), as here explained.

[2] The balance and rhythm of the original (*parisosis, paromoiosis*) are characteristic of this writer, but not of St. Paul. Instances of this style may no doubt be found in St. Paul's Epistles, because, as I have shown in my *Life of St. Paul* (i. 627), he had probably had some initial training in the rhetorical schools of Tarsus, and there is scarcely a single figure of speech or technical method of construction which he does not sometimes use. But they are not *characteristic* of him; they do not enter into the very heart of the periodic structure which he naturally adopts. If I may use a current distinction, St. Paul is often *rhetorical*—*i.e.*, he writes with passion which finds natural expression in the most forcible figures of speech; but he is scarcely ever *oratorical*—*i.e.*, he never *studies* the form of his sentences with a view to pleasing or satisfying the ear. He does not habitually adopt a stately, sounding, and impressive style. Now, the writer of this Epistle is scarcely ever impassioned; he is never quite swept away by the force of his own feelings, as St. Paul repeatedly is; and he is always oratorical—it was evidently natural to him to adopt such expressions and such a periodic structure as fill and gratify the ear, while at the same time they give impressiveness to the arguments which he is endeavouring to enforce. I have always insisted (see *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 601, 610) on the necessity of making the fullest allowance for the change of style which may be caused by the different moods, or circumstances, or objects of an author at different ages of his life; but no author can continuously adopt a style which is alien to the characteristics of his own temperament; and to me it is only necessary to read the Epistle to the Hebrews side by side with any Epistle of St. Paul to feel more and more strongly that it is *impossible* that the two should have emanated from the same mind.

[3] He does not venture on the strong word *athetêsis*, "disannulment," till he has, so to speak, prepared his way for it by the much milder word "*metathesis*"—"transference," or "alteration," in ver. 12.

ableness—(for the Law perfected nothing)—and the introduction of a better hope, by means of which we draw nigh to God.[1]

(vi.) It was superior because it was founded on the swearing of an oath,[2]—namely, that of Psalm cix. 4—which was not the case with the Levitic Priests. "Of so much better a covenant"[3] hath Jesus become a surety.[4]

(vii.) It was superior because the Levitic Priests were necessarily many, requiring to be constantly replenished, to fill up the ravages made in their ranks by death; but His Priesthood, because of His Eternal permanence, is intransmissible; whence, also, He is able to save to the uttermost those who through Him approach to

[1] vii. 11—19. The E. V. in the latter verse follows a bad punctuation of the Greek. The word ἐπεισαγωγὴ is not the nominative of ἐτελείωσεν, but of γίνεται—"there takes place a cancelling of the previous commandment and a superinduction of a better hope."

[2] The writer uses the sounding word ὁρκωμοσία as being statelier and more impressive than ὅρκος.

[3] The E. V. here renders διαθήκη by "testament." Now διαθήκη is the Greek equivalent of "*berîth*," as in Baal Berith ("the Lord of the Covenant") in Judg. ix. 4; and *berîth* is rendered by the LXX. διαθήκη, and by our version "covenant," at least 200 times. In fact, in the Old Testament the word *can* have no other meaning, for the Romans invented the "will," and the Jews knew nothing of testamentary bequests. It is certain, then, that any Jew reading this passage, and familiar with the LXX., would take the word to mean "covenant," and not "testament." The Vulgate uses "testamentum," because in Classic Greek διαθήκη often has this meaning; but, as Dr. Moulton remarks, it seems clear from such passages as Ps. lxxxiii. 5 that St. Jerome used it in a wider sense than that of "will." It is from the influence of the Vulgate that we get our phrase "the Old and New Testaments." There is happily nothing misleading or erroneous in the term, but there can be little doubt that St. Paul, from the translation of whose expression the term is derived (2 Cor. iii. 6), meant "Old *Covenant*," and not "Old Testament." What the meaning of the word is in ix. 15—17 we shall see in the notes to that passage.

[4] vii. 20, 21. As Eternal Priest, he is a pledge (Ecclus. xxix. 15) of the validity of the New Covenant (ver. 25; see viii. 1).

God, seeing that He ever liveth to intercede for them.[1]

Having thus in seven particulars proved how far superior was the Melchizedek Priesthood of Christ to the Levitic Priesthood, and having incidentally introduced the important truth that this transference of Priesthood involved the abrogation not only of Levitism, but of the whole Mosaic system, he adds a weighty summary of all that he has said about Melchizedek as a Type of Christ, into which, in his usual skilful manner, he introduces the vein of thought which he proceeds to develop in the three following chapters:—

"*For*," he says—and this "*for*" clinches the whole argument by showing the moral fitness which there was for the disannulment of the old imperfect Priesthood, and the introduction of a better hope—"for such a high priest even became us—holy,[2] harmless,[3] undefiled,[4] separated from sinners,[5] and made loftier than the heavens; who hath not daily necessity,[6] even as those high priests have, first

[1] vii. 22—25. Comp. Is. lix. 16, and a passage in Philo on the mediation of the "Eldest Word" (*Quis rer. div. haer. Opp.* i. 501, *ed.* Mangey).

[2] Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27; חָסִיד—"holy" as regards God.

[3] Blameless as regards man.

[4] Comp. ix. 4; 1 Pet. i. 19; Lev. xxi. 17.

[5] The High Priest was in a general sense "separated" (Lev. x. 10; xxii. 2; 1 Chr. xxiii. 13; Jos. *Antt.* iii. 12, § 2), but he was more specially separated for the week before the Day of Atonement (Yoma, f. 2, *a*).

[6] If this is interpreted to mean that the High Priest offered sacrifices *daily*, the expression taken literally is inaccurate; for, normally, the High Priest only offered sacrifices once a year, as the writer seems to have been well aware (ix. 25; x. 1, 3). Various ways have been suggested for meeting the difficulty; *e.g.*, (α) that "daily" means "on one fixed day every year"; or (β) "often," since it appears that the High Priest *might*, if he chose, offer sacrifices on other occasions (Lev. vi. 19—22; Jos. *B. J.* v. 5, § 7), or might be represented by one of his sons; or that the expression is, as Bengel says, "indignabunda hyperbole." But if the expression refers either to the daily *meat*-offerings—the "*Mincha*"—(Ex. xxix. 38—42; Lev. vi. 13—16, 20; Eccles. xlv. 11), or to the morning and evening

on behalf of his own sins to offer sacrifices, then on behalf of the sins of the people: for this he did once for all in offering up himself. For the law appoints human beings who have infirmity as high priests; but the utterance of the oath, which was *after* the law, appoints a Son, perfected[1] for ever more" (vii. 26—28).

SECTION V.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

It is evident that in this passage the thoughts of the writer are passing from Melchizedek to the Levitic High Priest in his grandest function on the Day of Atonement. The ideal of his whole position on that day was that he should be free from every ceremonial pollution as a type of his freedom from every stain of sin and wrong. In order to represent as fully as possible this ideal cleanness, he had to be accompanied, and kept awake all the previous night, and had on the day itself to submit to five washings and

sacrifices in which he might, if he chose, take part, there can be no question that these, so far as we can find any traces in the Law, had nothing to do with the expiation of sins. On the other hand, the High Priest might, if he chose, offer the daily incense, which was regarded as partly expiatory, (Lev. xvi. 11, 12). "We are taught," says the Talmud, "that incense atones" (Num. xvi. 47), the silent smoke atoning for slanders spoken in a whisper (Yoma, f. 44, *a*). Some, again, have supposed that it was a custom for the High Priest to take part in daily expiatory sacrifices in the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis, in Lower Egypt, and that the writer is thinking of this Temple—a conjecture of the most baseless kind. It is certain that Philo uses the same expression exactly, for he speaks of the High Priests "offering on each day prayers and sacrifices" (*De Spec. Legg.*, § 23; see, too, in the Talmud, Chagigah, ii. 4; Pesachim. f. 57, *a*). It may, however, be doubted whether there is any inaccuracy in the mind of the writer, for he possibly *means* that "Christ had no need to offer sacrifices for daily sins, as the High Priests had year by year to offer a sacrifice for the sins which they daily committed."

[1] Ver. 5, 6, 9; ii. 10; Pss. ii., cx. The rendering "consecrated" (in our version) is taken from Lev. xxi. 10; Ex. xxix. 9, but is much less appropriate.

ten purifications. The Day of Atonement was so memorable in its symbolism—it stirred so intensely the hopes or fears of the people—it was supposed to be attended by so many supernatural omens, on the presence or absence of which the whole welfare of the people depended during the ensuing year—the anxiety caused by any accident which impaired the due ceremonies was so extreme—that the Jews regarded no precaution as extravagant which could ensure the due performance of the requisite ceremonial. It was a shock to the feelings of the whole nation when, on one occasion, the High Priest Ishmael Ben Phabi had been incapacitated from his functions because, in spite of all the long and elaborate endeavours to make his legal cleanliness complete, he had after all become ceremonially unclean, and had been compelled to depute his Sagan to perform the most memorable of his yearly duties. In this instance the pollution had arisen because he had been conversing with the Arab ethnarch Hareth (Aretas), and a speck of the Emir's saliva had touched the High Priest's beard. It was impossible, therefore, by any amount of lustrations or isolation to secure so small a matter as the *ceremonial* cleanness of the High Priest for even one day in all the year; but Jesus was morally, in inmost reality, and for all eternity, that which the human Priest could not be even ceremonially, even in semblance, even for a single day—the sinless offerer of one all-sufficient offering for the sins of all the world.

Having exhausted the comparison of the Priesthood of Christ with that of the Levites, the writer proceeds to a comparison of their respective ministrations, which continues to chap. x. 18.

"But the chief point in all we are saying is this:[1] Such is the High Priest whom we have, who sat on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens,[2] a minister of the sanctuary[3] and of the genuine tabernacle[4] which the Lord pitched, not man. For every High Priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; whence it is necessary that this High Priest also have something which he may offer.[5] Now, if he were upon earth, he would not be a priest at all,[6] since there are priests already who offer the gifts according to the law[7]—the priests who serve an outline and shadow of the heavenly things; even as Moses when about to complete the tabernacle has been Divinely admonished[8]—for See, he says, that thou make all things[9] according to the pattern[10] shown

[1] The context shows that κεφάλαιον here cannot mean "summary," for it is by no means a summary, and it also adds fresh particulars. The word is here used in its proper classical sense of "chief point" (Thuc. iv. 50; vi. 16). Dr. Field would render it, "Now *to crown* (or *sum up*) our present discourse" (*Otium Norvicense*, iii. 141).

[2] On this sonorous amplification see *ante*, p. 406. *n*. The ἐκάθισεν seems to be a mark of emphatic pre-eminence (comp. x. 11, 12).

[3] This is probably the meaning of τῶν ἁγίων here as elsewhere in this Epistle (ix. 8, 12, &c.; x. 19; xiii. 11), and not "of the saints" (Œcumenius) or "of holy things."

[4] The ideal Archetypal (ἀληθινός) Tabernacle is not only real (ἀληθής), but the perfected reality of its material counterpart (comp. ix. 24; x. 22; John i. 9). To see in this Tabernacle "the glorified body of Christ" is to give it here too special a meaning.

[5] Namely the Blood of His own finished sacrifice (ix. 14).

[6] Not even a Priest, much less a High Priest.

[7] The present tenses, here as elsewhere, seem to show decisively that the Epistle was written before the fall of Jerusalem.

[8] κεχρημάτισται. The use of the perfect is due to the writer's mode of regarding everything which has been said in the Bible as a present actuality (iv. 9, &c.). For the meaning of the word itself see Lk. ii. 26; Acts x. 22; Matt. ii. 12, 22.

[9] Ex. xxv. 40. In the Hebrew and LXX. it is simply "make *it*," not "*all things*;" but this remarkable variation is due to Philo (*De Leg. Allegg.* iii. 33).

[10] It seems to be a very idle enquiry whether this pattern was something real, or only an idea, so that the Tabernacle was "a shadow of a shadow," or only a vision. These are questions which would not so much as occur either to Moses or to the writer, and are in any case otiose because incapable of being decided. The notion that there is in Heaven a real Tabernacle of which that erected by Moses was an exact counterpart—"a fiery ark, and a fiery candlestick, and a fiery table," which descended from

thee in the mount. But now he has obtained a better ministration in proportion[1] as he is also a mediator[2] of a better covenant—one which has been constituted upon better promises.[3] For had that first covenant been faultless,[4] no place would have been sought for a second" (viii. 1—7).

But—as he goes on to argue—place *has* been sought for a second, and this is sufficiently demonstrated by the passage of the Prophet Jeremiah[5] in which, by way of blame[6] to his countrymen, he says, that the days should come when Jehovah would accomplish[7] for Israel and Judah a New Covenant, unlike the one which he made for their fathers in the day when He took them by the hand to lead them forth from Egypt—and that because they did not abide in His Covenant, therefore He rejected them.[8] But

Heaven for Moses to see—is mere Rabbinic letter-worship and superstition, founded on an abuse of the most ordinary principles of human language.

[1] This method of stating results by proportions is found in other passages of this Epistle (i. 4; iii. 3; vii. 22).

[2] A mediator between God and man, as the Introducer of the New Covenant. Philo applies the same term to Moses (comp. Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5).

[3] *Better* promises, because, as Theodoret says, the promises of the Mosaic dispensation—a land flowing with milk and honey, multitudes of children, &c.—were mostly temporal, but the new dispensation promised the kingdom of Heaven and Eternal Life.

[4] Whereas it *was* "weak and unprofitable" (vii. 18).

[5] Jer. xxxi. 31—34 (comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27). It forms, says Delitzsch, "the third part of the third trilogy of the three great trilogies into which the prophecies of Jeremiah may be divided." The reference evidently is to the days of the Messiah.

[6] The object of μεμφόμενος is not expressed, but probably it is αὐτοῖς. Comp. 2 Macc. ii. 7.

[7] συντελέσω is used for the less emphatic διαθήσομαι of the LXX., as a rendering of the Hebrew phrase, "to *cut* a covenant" (כרת ברית).

[8] In our E. V. it stands (Jer. xxxi. 32), "although I was a husband to them" (lit. "a lord," as in Hos. ii. 16; comp. Jer. iii. 14; Is. lxii. 4). But the quotation is from the LXX., which either follows a different reading

in the coming days the covenant which He would make would be marked by three great blessings, which were but partially understood by a few of the most enlightened under the Old Covenant—namely, the writing of the Law not on granite slabs, but on their hearts;[1] the immediate knowledge of God by all without human intervention; and the final pardon of sins. Such was to be the New Covenant which God promised. The fact that He called it "new" was a making the existing dispensation old,[2] and the fact of its being thus regarded as "old" showed that it was hastening to final decay—that the decree of dissolution had been passed upon it.

After this digression the writer resumes the subject on which he had touched in viii. 6—the superiority of the *ordinances of ministration* in the New Covenant over those which had been appointed in the Old. He wishes to prove, above all, the transcendent efficacy of Christ's high-priestly atonement as compared even with the most solemn sacrifices and the most sublime ceremonial of Jewish worship. To this he hastens as to the very heart of his subject, not pausing to explain any minor details of the Jewish sanctuary and its service, though these had a deep interest for him, and he would have been as admirably fitted as Philo himself to bring out the allegoric meaning of every shadowy type of the Mosaic dispensation. This, how-

(בגלותי), or takes another meaning of the verb בגלותי, which is perhaps tenable, as Kimchi asserts.

[1] viii. 8—13. Even the Rabbis, in their moments of saner exegesis, anticipated a day when the Law should cease to be. This they inferred from Deut. xxxi. 21. R. Bechai, on this verse, argues that the Law "shall be forgotten" when "the evil impulse" (the *yetzer ha-rá*) ceases to exist.

[2] This is the same argument as in vii. 11, &c.

ever, would have been impossible in a letter, and would have dissipated the attention of his readers, which he wished to concentrate on one central consideration. If he could but convince them that "Christ was the end of the Law"—that by His sacrifice all other sacrifices had been rendered needless—that His resurrection and ascension robbed of all its meaning the splendid ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, which was the crowning event of the Jewish year—then it would be impossible for them to relapse into Judaism out of any admiration for the ordinary routine of its liturgical appliances.

"To resume, then, even the first (covenant)[1] had its ordinances of public worship,[2] and its sanctuary—a worldly one.[3] For a tabernacle was established; the outer one, in which is[4] the lampstand,[5] and the table, and the setting forth of the shewbread[6]—

There can be no reasonable doubt that "Covenant" (διαθήκη) and not "Tabernacle" (σκηνὴ), as in our text, is the proper word to supply with ἡ πρώτη. It is true that σκηνὴ is read by the Coptic Version and one or two cursive MSS., probably from the mistaken supposition that πρώτη means "first," and not "outer," in ver. 8. But the author has been thinking all along of two Covenants, not of two Tabernacles, and the Heavenly Tabernacle as in no sense a second Tabernacle, but the first in order as in pre-eminence.

[2] ix. 1; *Leitourgia;* hence our "liturgy." The classic meaning of the word was a public service rendered to the State.

[3] Κοσμικὸν—*i.e.*, "visible," "material," "temporary," in contrast to the one which was not of this world. The notion of Schöttgen and Bp. Middleton that *Kosmikon* is a Rabbinic expression for "furniture" is mistaken.

[4] I supply "is," and not "*was*," because the writer uses the present (λέγεται, εἰσίασιν, etc.), in accordance with the vivid presentment to his imagination of everything mentioned in Scripture, as though it were eternally existent. See on vii. 6—8, etc.

[5] Ex. xxv. 31—37. The writer is thinking throughout of the Mosaic Tabernacle, not of the Temples of Solomon or Herod. In Solomon's Temple there were ten lampstands (1 Kings vii. 49). In the second Temple there was only one (1 Macc. i. 21; iv. 49; Jos. *Antt.* xii. 7, § 6).

[6] The table has no importance except for the shewbread, or "Bread of

which is called the holy place.[1] But behind the second veil[2] was the tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies,[3] having a golden incenser,[4] and the ark of the covenant overlaid on all sides with gold, in which are a golden pot holding the manna, and the rod of Aaron which budded, and the tables of the covenant; and above it the cherubim of glory overshadowing the propitiatory, respecting which things I cannot now speak generally" (ix. 1—5).

We must follow the example of the writer in not being tempted to linger over the facts upon which he here slightly touches. Doubtless, had he been able to expand the symbolism of the Tabernacle he would have elucidated points which are still dark to us. We are, however, able to see something of the meaning of the Holiest Place, with the few things which it contained. It was always shrouded in

the Face" (of God), rendered by the LXX. "Loaves of the setting forth" (see Gen. xxv. 23—30; Lev. xxiv. 5—9). There were ten of these acacia-wood tables overlaid with gold in Solomon's Temple (2 Chr. iv. 8, 19).

[1] Probably ἅγια, "Holy (places)," neut. pl.; not ἁγία, fem. sing. He uses the generic name.

[2] The curtain called *Parôketh* hung between the Holy Place and the Holiest (Ex. xxvi. 31—35); the other curtain, called *Mâsâk* (Ex. xxvi. 36 37), hung before the Tabernacle door. The LXX. in some places call both these curtains καταπέτασμα, and in other passages use κάλυμμα or ἐπίσπαστρον for the outer one. Philo also in one place (*Vit. Mos.* iii. 9) calls the outer one κάλυμμα. The Rabbis often speak of *two* curtains between the Holy and the Holiest Place, with a sort of lobby—a space of a cubit's breadth—between them, called the *Tarkesin*. The derivation of the word is much disputed. Some connect it with the Greek τάραξις, "confusion," because the builders were "confused" as to whether it belonged to the Holy Place or the Holiest; and there are other conjectures equally improbable. The fact itself is more than doubtful. As to the *Parôketh*, or Inner Veil, the Rabbis said that it was a hand-breadth thick, woven of 72 cords each 24 strands thick; that it was 40 cubits long, and 20 wide; that it took 300 priests to draw it, etc. (Chullin, f. 90, *b*).

[3] Ἅγια ἁγίων, like the Latin *Sancta Sanctorum*, is a literal rendering of the Hebrew *Kodesh hak-Kedashim*, for which one version uses "Most Holy," or "the Holy Place." In Solomon's Temple it was called "the Oracle."

[4] See *infra*. I use this word in order not to prejudice the question as to whether it means Thurible or Altar of Incense.

darkness, except for the moment when the High Priest lifted the curtain to enter its awful precincts. No window or opening of any kind admitted into it a single ray of light, and the interior was only visible to the High Priest in the crimson gleam of the thurible from which rose the clouds of fragrant incense. But in the Ark, containing the granite slabs on which were carved the Ten Words of Sinai—with the Propitiatory above it[1] and the "Cherubim of glory"[2] bending over it, we cannot fail to recognise an emblem of all that is highest and best in Creation upholding the throne of the Eternal, and rapt in adoring contemplation of that Moral Law which is the revelation of His will.

It is, however, to be borne in mind that what the writer says of the furniture of the Temple is applicable primarily to the Tabernacle, and, only in a lower degree, to the Temple of Solomon. As an Alexandrian, he had no personal knowledge of the ritual, but derived his views from the Pentateuch. To the Herodian Temple of his own day, and even to the Temple of Zerubbabel, his description is not applicable. In the Holiest Place of the later Temple there was nothing.[3] The Ark had disappeared at the time of the Babylonian Captivity.

[1] The word ἱλαστήριον, "propitiatory," is a rendering of the Hebrew *cappôreth*, which means a "covering." It is translated "mercy-seat" in our version from the notion that it implied the covering *of sins*, and the LXX. selected the word ἱλαστήριον, or ἐπίθεμα, to represent it, because upon it was sprinkled the blood of the propitiatory offering.

[2] The expression means much more than "glorious Cherubim." It no doubt means the Cherubim which bear on their wings the Glory of God, the Shechinah or Cloud of Light which was the symbol of His Presence (Hag. ii. 7—9; Meuschen, p. 701). Even the Jews spoke of the passage in Ezekiel which describes the Cherubim as "the chariot," and it was a favourite passage with the Kabbalists.

[3] Jos. *B. J.* v. 5, § 5; ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ.

When Pompey, nearly a hundred years before, had, to the horror of the Jews, profanely forced his way into the inmost shrine, he had been amazed to find that there was nothing whatever—*vacua omnia!* The mass of native rock on which the Ark had once stood—called by the Rabbis "the stone of the foundation," —alone was visible. The absence of everything else perhaps originated the notion that the Jews worshipped "nothing except clouds and the Deity of Sky," just as the living creatures which formed part of the Cherubim may have helped to give currency to the old ignorant Pagan slander that they worshipped an ass.

Two questions are raised by this brief glance at the furniture of the Tabernacle, which we are bound to examine because they affect the accuracy of the Epistle, and have been supposed to bear on the question of its authorship.

I. Of these the minor question is, Has not the writer fallen into a mistake in saying that the Ark contained not only the Tables of the Law, but also the golden pot of manna,[1] and Aaron's rod that budded? Speaking of Solomon's Temple, the First Book of Kings (viii. 9)[2] says that "there was nothing in the Ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb;" and in Ex. xxv. 16, 21; xl. 20, we are told that he put "the testimony" into the Ark. Neither in those passages, nor in Deut. x. 2, 5, are we told that

[1] The word rendered "pot" is στάμνος. It seems to mean a jar with a tapering base. The Palestine Targum calls it "earthen," but Jewish tradition always spoke of it as made of gold, and the epithet "golden" is added by the LXX. in Ex. xvi. 33, as also by Philo. Perhaps a golden pot was substituted for the earthen one in Solomon's Temple. It contained one "omer" of manna, which was the daily portion for each person (Ex. xvi. 16, 32).

[2] Comp. 2 Chr. v. 10.

he put anything besides.[1] But in Ex. xvi. 33, 34 Moses is bidden to lay up a pot of manna, and in Num. xvii. 10 to lay up Aaron's rod which budded, "*before* the testimony" and "*before* the Lord." Since these expressions are not defined, it is obvious that they may have been interpreted to mean either *in* the Ark or in front of it. It is idle to contend that there would have been no room for them inside the Ark when we have no indication as to the size of the tables of stone. In these small matters much was left to the discretion of the High Priests. The statement of the Book of Kings only applies to Solomon's Temple, and since the writer of this Epistle is not thinking of Solomon's Temple, but only of the Tabernacle, he may be following a trustworthy tradition in stating that these memorials had in former days been placed inside the Ark. They might have been removed when the Ark was hurried from place to place in the troublous times of the Judges—lest the frailer objects should have been broken to pieces by the slabs of stone. Nothing was

[1] The Talmud says the tables of stone were "*six* handbreadths long, *six* broad, and *three* thick" (Nedarim, f. 38, *a*), and they weighed, according to the Targum of Palestine, 40 *seahs*. But the Talmudic estimate is probably very excessive. The Talmud says farther that the *broken* Tables, as well as the new ones, were stored up in the Ark—which Rashi inferred from Deut. x. 2 (Berachoth, f. 8, *b*; Kethuboth, f. 104, *a*)—and also the Roll of the Law, written by Moses (Bava Bathra, f. 14, *a*). As to the disappearance of the Ark, they say that Josiah hid it because of Deut. xxviii. 36, and this they inferred from 2 Chr. xxxv. 3 (Yoma, f. 52, *b*). But "the foundation-stone" was supposed still to remain 3 inches above the soil. A priest who, by the condition of the plaster, conjectured the spot in the wood-store where the Ark was hidden, died immediately; and once when a priest was in the wood-store, he happened to drop his chopper on the spot above where it was hidden, whereon fire sprang forth and consumed him. The stone on which it had rested was believed to be (like the *omphalos* at Delphi) the centre of the world (see Hershon, *Talmudic Miscellany, etc.*)

farther from the intention of the Rabbis than the desire to vindicate the accuracy of the Christian writer who directed against them so powerful a polemic; yet Rabbi Levi Ben Gershom, Abarbanel, and others testify to the existence of the tradition which is here followed.[1] There is, therefore, no necessity for the theory of Michaelis that the "*in which*" is the mistake of some one who was translating the Epistle into Greek from an Aramaic original. There is still less room for the suggestion of Danzius and others, supported by expressions which are not at all parallel, that "*in* which" can mean "*together with* which." It would be better to acknowledge a difficulty than to remove it by such desperate expedients. In this case there is no difficulty. In the Temple of our Lord's day there was no Ark at all;[2] in the Temple of Solomon the manna-pot and the rod were probably placed in front of the Ark; but in the Tabernacle of the Wilderness there can be little doubt that these objects were actually inside the Ark as the writer says.

II. But it is asserted that he made a mistake in saying that the "*thumiaterion*" was in the Holy of Holies. The word which he uses is rendered "censer" in our version.[3] It does not occur[4] in the Greek version of the Pentateuch, where the "altar of incense" is called τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος (Ex. xxxi. 8; Lk. i. 11). But the LXX. use it in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19; Ezek. viii. 11,

[1] See Wetstein, *ad loc.* The reader will find a full discussion of these particulars in Prideaux's *Connection*, i. 138.

[2] Yoma, v. 2; Surenhusius, *Mishna*, ii. 233.

[3] And in the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and Æthiopic; and the word is so understood by Theophylact, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Wetstein, Bengel, Reland, Stier, &c.

[4] Except as a various reading.

and in both of these places it means "censer." The Rabbis assert that the High Priest used on all other days a silver censer, but a golden one on the Day of Atonement.[1] On the other hand, in Philo and Josephus the word *thumiaterion* means the "altar of incense," and this might be called "golden," though in reality it was only of acacia-wood overlaid with gold.[2] Considering how deeply the author is influenced by Philo, and also that in the Hellenistic Greek of his day—from Josephus to Clemens of Alexandria—the word is used for the "altar of incense," it is most probable that this is here the meaning. But since both "censer" and "altar of incense" are closely connected with the ceremonies of the great Day of Atonement, of which the writer is here thinking, we cannot come to any positive decision as to which of the two he meant.

But now occurs the further difficulty—Were *either* of these objects in the Holiest Place?

a. As regards the *censer*, if that be the meaning here intended, it may have been kept in the Holiest, and, though we cannot corroborate the assertion from other sources, the writer may be following a correct Jewish tradition in saying that it was. Or, again, the name may have been given to some permanent golden censer-stand in the Holiest Place on which the High Priest placed the small brazier or shovel-shaped basin (*machettah*, LXX. *pureion*) which he carried with him when he stood before the Ark on the Day of Atonement.

β. As regards the *altar of incense*, if we assume that to be the meaning of the word, there is no

[1] Yoma, iv. 4.

[2] In Solomon's Temple it was of cedar-wood.

question that it was *not* in the Holiest. No tradition ever asserted, or could have asserted, that it was. If the writer meant that it was, he then made a mistake which even in an Alexandrian Jew would be almost inconceivable, and as to which Philo, with whose writings he was so familiar, would have set him right.[1] But it may be fairly argued that he did *not* mean to say that the incense-altar was *inside* the Holiest Place. If he did, why does he go out of his way to vary the expression? He tells us that the manna-pot and the rod were "*in* the Ark," but he only says that the Holiest Place "*had*" the *thumiaterion* and the Ark, and we cannot assert that the change of phrase is due to the rhetorical desire for variation. The phrase "having" may therefore be adopted to apply not only to the Ark which was inside the Holiest, but also to the altar which, though not actually inside, was close outside the veil, and was intimately associated with the Holiest, not only in the use to which it was put, but also by the express language of Scripture. On the Day of Atonement, when the Veil was drawn, the altar of incense might be said, in the strictest sense, to *belong to* the Holiest Place.[2]

"Since then these things have been thus arranged, into the outer tabernacle the priests enter continually in the performance of their ministrations;[3] but into the inner, once in a

[1] Philo, *De vict. off.* § 4.

[2] See Excursus XI. "The Altar of Incense and the Holiest Place." If this view be correct—and certainly it cannot be disproved—the ἔχουσα will be equivalent to the Hebrew ל, in the sense of "belonging to," in 1 Kings vi. 22 ("the altar which was לַדְּבִיר to the Oracle").

[3] Num. xviii. 7. The ordinary priestly duties were to offer sacrifice, burn incense, and light the lamps. No priest might enter the Holiest, except the Sagan, and then only in most exceptional circumstances; but the

year,[1] the High Priest alone, not without blood, which he offers on his own behalf and for the ignorances[2] of the people:[3] the Holy Spirit signifying this, that the entrance into the Holiest had not yet been manifested, while yet the outer Tabernacle stands[4]—which outer Tabernacle is a parable for the present time, in accordance with which (parable)[5] both gifts and sacrifices are offered, such as are not able as far as conscience is concerned to perfect the worshipper;[6] seeing that

High Priest might perform any of the ordinary functions if he chose. The graduated sanctity of the rest of the Tabernacle—which gave its special awfulness to the Holiest—was remarkable. In the Temple all might enter the outmost court; all Jews the second court; all males the third; priests alone, in their robes, might enter the first chamber; the High Priest alone, in his robes, might enter the shrine (Jos. *c. Apion.* ii. 8).

[1] Undoubtedly the High Priest must actually have entered into the Holiest three times (Lev. xvi. 12—16), if not four times (Yoma. v. 2; vii. 2), on the Day of Atonement (the 10th of Tishri)—viz. (1) with the incense; (2) with the blood of the bullock offered for his own sins; (3) with the blood of the goat offered for the sins of the people; and (4) to remove the censer. But these entrances were practically only one, as they were but parts of one grand ceremony. There was no need of pragmatic accuracy when this would be at once understood by every reader. On such matters the ancients, and especially Semitic writers, cared much less than the moderns for pedantic exactness.

[2] No doubt ἀγνοήματα is used generally to include sins and errors of all kinds (v. 2, 3; vii. 27; Ex. xxxiv. 7).

[3] I have rendered the Greek literally, but no doubt ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ means "for his own sins," and, as we learn from Lev. xvi. 6, 11, for those of his house. The confession of the High Priest was made in the following terms: "And now, O Lord, I have sinned, and done iniquity, and trespassed before Thee. I pray therefore, O Lord, cover my sins and iniquities and trespasses, wherein I have sinned, offended, and trespassed against Thee!"

[4] The outer Tabernacle was the place of the priests in general, who might not penetrate further. "Stands"—the present is used in accordance with the general idiom of the Epistle. See *supra*, p. 366, *n*. The writer throws himself vividly into the past, and so he conceives of all the contemplated arrangements as still existing.

[5] Leg. καθ' ἥν; A, B, D, etc.

[6] The "parable," or typical meaning, of the Tabernacle and its service is this: The object of the gifts and sacrifices is to obtain entrance into God's presence; but since the Holiest is not opened by them, the result is not obtained; which shows that the worshippers, so far as their inmost hearts are concerned, are not perfected.

they consist only in meats and drinks, and divers washings[1]—being ordinances of the flesh, imposed (only) till the season of reformation"[2] (ix. 6—10).

"But Christ having appeared, a High Priest of the good things to come,[3] through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this (visible) creation;[4] nor even by means of the blood of bulls and goats, but by means of His own blood, entered once for all into the Holiest Place, obtaining for us eternal redemption.[5] For if the blood of goats and bulls,[6] and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the defiled,[7] sanctifies to the purity of the

[1] Meats (Ex. xii.; Lev. xi.; Num. vi.); drinks (Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 3); divers washings (vi. 2; Ex. xix. 10, 11; xxix. 4; Lev. xv. 8; xvii. 5; xxii. 5). See on both classes of observance the teaching of Christ (Mk. vii. 1—15).

[2] ix. 6—10. It is not meant that the system of sacrifices was useless, but only that in themselves—and apart from the grace of God which might be imparted by their faithful use—they could not give perfect ease and peace, or gain admission for the worshipper into the presence of God. There is probably a slight sense of painful burden in the word ἐπικείμενα (comp. Acts xv. 10). The "reformation" (διόρθωσις) is that prophesied by Jeremiah (see viii. 7—12). Various other ways of translating this clause have been suggested, but the one which I have adopted seems to me so much the more correct that I do not mention others.

[3] In B and D we have the reading "good things that have come" (γενομένων).

[4] Comp. viii. 2. But *here* it seems best, with Chrysostom and many of the Fathers, to understand this Tabernacle, through which Christ passed, of His Human Nature (ἐσκήνωσεν, John i. 14; comp. ii. 19; xiv. 10; Col. ii. 9). Of the other explanations the best is perhaps that of Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, etc., who understand it of "the lower heavens" (comp. iv. 14). Moll renders διὰ "by means of;" κτίσις may mean "building," on the analogy of κτίζω, but in that case ταύτης must mean "vulgar," "ordinary"—*quae vulgo dicitur* (Field, *Otium Norvicense*, iii. 142).

[5] Λύτρωσιν, "ransom," with its cognate words, occurs in ver. 15 and xi. 35; Matt. xx. 28; Lk. xxi. 28; xxiv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18. The metaphor applies only to the effects of the Redemption *as regards man*, whom it sets free from the bondage of sin. So little is the notion of its *Divine* side dwelt upon, that it is never said to whom the ransom is paid, and for many centuries the Church in general held the strange and grievous notion that it was paid to Satan.

[6] Lev. xvi.

[7] See Num. xix. 9 (comp. xii. 24). Thus, in this verse he refers, by way of example, to the two most significant ceremonies of the Jewish Law.

flesh, how much more shall the blood of the Christ,[1] who through an eternal Spirit[2] offered Himself without blemish[3] to God, purify your conscience from dead works[4] to serve the living God?"[5] (ix. 11—14.)

"And on this account"—*i.e.*, because of the greatness of His work—"He is a mediator of a *new* covenant, that—when death had occurred for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant—they who have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. For where there is *a testament* it is necessary that there should be legally involved the death of the testator. For *a testament* is of force in the case of the dead—since is there any validity in it when the testator lives?"[6] (ix. 15—17.)

We must pause for a moment to examine the meaning of the last two verses. A voluminous controversy has arisen about them, because we seem to be almost compelled to alter the translation "*covenant*," which throughout the Epistle has been the only tenable rendering of *diathêkê*, and—in these two verses only—to substitute for it the rendering *testament* or *will*. This has seemed to many commentators a great difficulty. In the quotation from Jeremiah (xxxi. 31—34), which plays so important a part in the ar-

[1] The blood of Christ was the *true* fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness (Zech. xiii. 1).

[2] Probably His own Spirit is intended—"per ardentissimam caritatem a Spiritu Ejus aeterno profectam" (Œcolamp.). If we explain it of the Holy Spirit, we must refer, by way of parallel, to such passages as Matt. xii. 28; Lk. xi. 20.

[3] The word used by the LXX. for sacrificial victims (comp. 1 Pet. i. 19).

[4] Comp. vi. 1. Here the expression has possibly a slight reference to the dead things which caused pollution under the Levitical Law. The writer does not here attempt to *explain* the mystery of the efficacy of Christ's blood, which is indeed, on the *Divine* side, inexplicable; he only dwells on it as a revealed fact—in its effects for us.

[5] ix. 11—14. For the expression "living God" see Deut. xxv. 26.

[6] ix. 15—17. The μηπότε is most simply explained by regarding the clause as a question.

gument of the Epistle, διαθήκη *must* mean "covenant," and this meaning must be retained in the following verses even as far as verse 15. It may well seem extraordinary that in the very next verses (16 and 17), and these alone, the different sense — which is the *classical* sense of the word — should be introduced. After these two verses the word evidently reverts to its normal sense. For the Old Dispensation alluded to in verse 20 was indeed "a covenant," but could only be called a "testament" by a remote analogy. Yet, if on these grounds we resist the concession of a new meaning in the two verses before us, we have to reconcile with plain facts the statement, that "when there is a *covenant* there must also be of necessity the death of him who made it." This is attempted by arguing that in verse 15 the death spoken of is the death of Jesus; that the new covenant was "a covenant in Christ's blood" (1 Cor. xi. 25); and that no covenant could be established without the death of sacrificial victims (Gen. xv. 9, 10; Ps. l. 5), in which the death of the covenanter is *implied* (φέρεσθαι),[1] either as a *punishment* if he should break the compact, or as involving a total change—a sort of death—as regards the past or the future. We should then be obliged to render verse 17 by "a covenant is of force *over dead victims*," and to regard Jesus as both the mediator and maker of the covenant. Thus the death of the covenanter becomes a sort of ideal conception — an imaginative realisation of the supposed significance of the sacrifices over which the compact is made.

[1] Perhaps the word may be rendered "be proved or established" —*constare.*

However ingeniously these arguments may be stated, they attach to the writer's words a very vague and unnatural sense. I see no alternative but to suppose that the writer *does* in these two verses introduce a sort of side light from the classical meaning of the word *diathêkê*, which he has elsewhere been using in the ordinary Hellenistic sense.[1] These two verses do not belong to the essence of his argument. He is comparing the Old with the New Dispensation, and the old with the new Priesthood. In the Old the High Priest entered the Holiest with the blood of bulls and goats; in the New, Christ, as our Redeemer, passed with His own blood into the immediate presence of God. In both dispensations there was a purifying and propitiatory shedding of blood. In developing this argument the writer passingly recalls another illustration. The word which he is using has two recognised senses.[2] A *diathêkê* in the sense of a "covenant" involved the necessity for the death of sacrificial victims; a *diathêkê* in the sense of a "will" involved the necessity for the death of the testator; and he avails himself with perfect simplicity of this second meaning. To call this a Hellenistic play on

[1] How completely the illustration is an *obiter dictum* appears from this—(1) that he does not even touch upon the fact that Christ did not merely *die*, but died a violent and shameful and agonising death; and (2) does not pause to co-ordinate the two senses of *diathêkê*, or (3) explain the very distant analogy between the *necessity* of a death when there is a "will," and the (very different) sacrifice of victims when there is a "covenant."

[2] דייתיקי (*diîthîkî*) in the Talmud certainly means a "will," and is said also to be used in the sense of *Berîth* ("covenant"). It is of course only the Greek word *diathêkê*, though R. Obad. de Bartenora offers an astonishing Hebrew derivation for it (see McCaul, *ad loc.*). Originally (Deut. xxi. 16) the Jews knew nothing about "wills," but they learnt the use of them from the Romans.

words, or a specimen of sophistry, or a proof of feeble logic, is a mistaken method of criticism. The writer is not furnishing any *proof* of the necessity for Christ's death. If he were, he would have had to prove why the Christian Dispensation must be regarded as a *diathêkê*, which it is unnecessary for him to do. He is writing to those who have already accepted the truth of Christianity, and to whom, therefore, the necessity for Christ's death transcends the need of proof. He is comparing two dispensations, of which his readers are convinced that both have come from God, and his sole object is to prove the superiority of the latter. By the double sense of the word he is reminded, in passing, that death is the condition of inheritance by *testament*, just as death is the efficient cause of purification by *covenant*. "The same death which purifies us from guilt makes us partakers of the kingdom of glory; the same blood which cleanses us from sin seals the testament of our inheritance." It requires but a slight development of the literary sense to see that if, in carrying out his comparison, he could illustrate it by a momentary reference to another meaning of the word with which he is dealing, he is only adopting a method which might be used by any writer, whether ancient or modern.[1]

We may now resume the thread of the argument, which we will here translate, because of the extreme importance of this section of the Epistle.

[1] Philo similarly alludes to the two senses of the word (*De Nom. Mutat.* § 6). Alford compares the term "New Testament" itself as bearing two meanings—a "book," and a "will." No one would accuse an English writer of sophistry or feeble logic if, in speaking of the Book, he introduced a passing illustration from the other meaning of the name by which the Book is called.

"Whence"—*i.e.*, because a "covenant" and a "testament" alike involve the idea of death; a *covenant* being ratified by the death of victims, and a *testament* involving the death of the testator —"not even the first covenant has been inaugurated[1] apart from blood. For when every commandment according to the Law had been spoken by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,[2] saying, 'This is the blood of the Covenant which God (Heb. Jehovah) commanded in regard to you.'[3] And the Tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministration, did he likewise so sprinkle with the blood,[4] and, speaking generally,[5] all things are purified with blood according to the Law, and without bloodshed[6] remission does not take place. It is necessary, then, that the outlines[7] of the things in the heavens

[1] *ἐγκεκαίνισται*—another of the perfects which, with the presents, are so characteristic of the writer. He regards every ordinance of Scripture either as representing a permanent fact, or as still continuing its past existence. The Alexandrian word *ἐγκαινίζω* is used by the LXX. (Deut. xx. 5; 1 Kings viii. 63), and means to "handsel." Hence the name "Encaenia," for the feast of the "Dedication" (John x. 22).

[2] Ex. xxiv. 3—7. The book of the Covenant was Ex. xx. 22—xxiii. 33. See *infra*, p. 430.

[3] *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*—*i.e.*, for me to deliver to you. In the LXX. for "*this* is the blood," we have the more literal rendering, "behold (הנה) the blood." Böhme and others suppose that the variation is due to a reminiscence of the words of Christ in inaugurating the Last Supper, as recorded in Luke xxii. 20. The writer substitutes 'commanded' (*ἐνετείλατο*) for the *διέθετο* of the LXX. The Hebrew as usual has "cut" (כרת).

[4] This was on another and later occasion, not recorded in Scripture, but implied in Ex. xl.

[5] There were a few exceptions (see Ex. xix. 10; Lev. v. 11—13; xv. 5; xvi. 26, 28; xxii. 6; Num. xxxi. 22—24). *Σχέδον* is only used elsewhere in Acts xiii. 44; xix. 26.

[6] De Wette and others render *αἱματεκχυσία*, "pouring out of blood," at the foot of the altar (Ex. xxix. 16; 2 Kings xvi. 15; 2 Chron. xxix. 22, LXX.). But the *pouring out* of the blood is secondary; it is the *shedding* of the blood which is of chief importance, and the meaning seems to be decided by Luke xxii. 20: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is being shed for you"; and (Lev. xvii. 11): "it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," whence the Rabbinic rule: "No expiation except by blood"—אין כפרה אלא בדם (Yoma, f. 5, *b*). The famous passages of the Prophets (Hos. vi. 6; Isa. i. 10—17, &c.) are directed not against the use of sacrifices, but against their abuse.

[7] *ὑποδείγματα* (iv. 11; viii. 5). They were "copies" (*Abbilden*), not "patterns" (*Urbilden*).

be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves[1] with sacrifices better than these.[2] For not into a material sanctuary did Christ enter—a (mere) imitation of the Ideal[3]—but into the Heaven itself, now to be visibly presented before the face of God for us. Nor yet did He enter Heaven that He may often present Himself there as the High Priest enters into the Holiest year by year with blood not his own—since it would then have been needful[4] for Him often to suffer since the foundation of the world; but now, once for all, at the consummation of the ages[5] has He been manifested[6] for the annulment of sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And, inasmuch as it is appointed for men once only to die, and, after this, judgment, —so also the Christ, having been once for all offered to bear[7] the sins of many,[8] shall, a second time, apart from sin,[9] appear, to those who wait for Him, for salvation"[10] (ix. 18—28).

[1] What is meant by "the heavenly things?" The notion that the phrase means "the new covenant" (Chrys., Œcumen.), or "the church" (Theophyl.), or ourselves as heirs of heaven (Tholuck), are only suggested to avoid the difficulty of supposing that heaven can need any purification. But the best proof that this natural meaning is the true one may be seen in Job iv. 18, "His angels He charged with folly."

[2] The plural is merely generic.

[3] The Ideal is that which is actual and eternal; the uncreated archetype as contrasted with the hand-made antitype. The word ἀντίτυπος is found only in 1 Pet. iii. 21. The better *sanctuary* is some proof that there was a better *sacrifice*. It is an argument from the *effect* to the *cause*.

[4] ἔδει. On this idiom, see Winer, § 41.

[5] Comp. Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20.

[6] ἐμφανισθῆναι. This *emphanismos* is the actual vision face to face (Ex. xxxiii. 13). The E. V. makes no difference between ἐμφανισθῆναι (ver. 24), πεφανέρωται (ver. 26), and ὀφθήσεται (ver. 28).

[7] Isa. liii. 12. The sense may be "to take *away*" in the Hebrew.

[8] Of course this does not mean that He did not bear the sins of *all*, as is again and again stated in Scripture; but "many" is used as the antithesis of "few." Once for all, *One* died for all, who were (quantitively) many. (See *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 216). Christ may be said both to offer Himself (v. 14), and to be offered (ver. 28), just as He is said to deliver up Himself for us (Eph. v. 2), or to be delivered for us (Rom. iv. 25).

[9] Not merely "without sin" (which would be ἄτερ), but "apart from all connexion with sin" (comp. vii. 26), either in the form of temptation (iv. 15) or burden (2 Cor. v. 21). At His first appearance also Christ was "without sin," but He was not "apart from sin," for He was tempted like as we are; and He was made sin for us; but at His second coming He shall have triumphed over sin, and taken it away (Dan. ix. 24, 25; Isa. xxv. 7—9).

[10] ix. 18—28. In this, as in so many other cases, it is remarkable how

It is worth while to notice, in passing, the familiarity of the writer with the Jewish Hagada and Halacha—that is, with the unrecorded circumstances which Jewish tradition added to the History or to the Ceremonial Law of the Sacred Books. In this chapter there are five or six references to one or the other. He has already said (1) that the pot of manna was of gold, and (2) that it and the rod of Aaron were in the Ark; and (3) that there was a close connexion between the altar of incense and the Holiest Place. In these latter verses he mentions (4) that Moses purified the people with the blood of the goats (which may be presumed to have been among the burnt-offerings mentioned in Ex. xxiv. 5); (5) that the sprinkling was done with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop (perhaps on the analogy of Ex. xii. 22, Num. xix. 6, Lev. xiv. 4—6, &c.); (6) that the Book of the Covenant was sprinkled as well as the people—perhaps from the Hagada that the book was lying on the altar when Moses sprinkled it (Ex. xxiv. 7); and (7) that on a subsequent occasion he sprinkled the Tabernacle and all its furniture. The latter circumstance is mentioned by Josephus.[1] It was

evidently the sacred writers, as a rule, avoid dwelling on the more terrible features of the Second Advent. "How shall He be seen?" says St. Chrysostom. "Does He say, as a Punisher? He did not say this, but the bright aspect." Their *normal* conception of the Returning Christ was not the wrathful avenging figure of Michael Angelo, with His right hand uplifted as He turns away from His interceding mother, to drive the lost myriads of humanity in dense herds before Him, but the Deliverer bringing glory and salvation to all His children. It is not that they exclude the other notion altogether (x. 27; 1 Thess. iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8), but they do not love to dwell on it. The parallelism of these two verses is as follows:—Man dies once, and then is judged; the Christ died once for man, and shall return to be (he might have said "the *Judge*," but he *does* say) "the *Saviour* of those who look for Him."

[1] *Antt.* iii. 8, § 6. On the whole passage see especially Bleek's Com-

probably done when Moses (Ex. xl. 9, 10) anointed the Tabernacle and its implements with holy oil. By a similar sprinkling Aaron and his sons were consecrated to their sacred functions (Lev. viii. 30), and the altar was touched with blood to hallow it for use. These seven references to the traditional lore of the Rabbis incidentally mark the writer as an accomplished "pupil of the wise."

But far more important is the general scope of this chapter as proving the unapproachable superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of the sons of Aaron.

If any one desired to contemplate the Levitical high priesthood in its grandest phase—to realise its antiquity, its sacredness, the splendour of its ministrations, and the awful sense of responsibility with which its representative was bound to fulfil its functions—he would naturally have turned his thoughts to the great Day of Atonement—that "Sabbath of Sabbatism"—which was the most memorable day of the Jewish year. It was the day of expiation for the sins of the whole people, and was observed as a perfect Sabbath.[1] It was the one fast-day of the Jewish calendar.[2] It was emphatically "*the* day." The seventy bullocks prescribed for sacrifice during this week were supposed to be an atonement not for Jews only, but for the seventy nations of the world.[3]

It was supposed that on New Year's Day (Tishri 1)

mentary. Philo, *De Vit. Mos.* iii. 18 (*Opp.* ii. 157, *ed.* Mangey) is referred to, but he does not make this statement.

[1] Lev. xvi. 31: שבת שבתון.

[2] The bi-weekly fasts of the Pharisees in the days of Christ were a later invention. (See *Life of Christ*, i. 349.)

[3] Succah, f. 55, *b*.

the Divine decrees are written down, and that on the Day of Atonement (Tishri 10) they are sealed,[1] so that the decade is known by the name of "Terrible Days," and "the Ten Penitential Days." So awful was the Day of Atonement that we are told in a Jewish book of ritual that the very angels run to and fro in fear and trembling, saying, "Lo, the Day of Judgment has come!" It was not until that day that the full pardon was granted which repentance had insured.[2] On that day the year of Jubilee was proclaimed. On that day alone the people came early to the synagogues and left them late.[3] On that day alone, they said, Satan has no power to accuse, for Ha-Satan by numeration (Gematria) is 364, which means that on the one remaining day of the year he is forced to be silent.[4] To die on the eve of that day was a good omen.[5] It was supposed to be the day on which Adam had sinned and repented; on which Abraham was circumcised; on which the latter tables had been given to Moses.[6] It was supposed by some to secure pardon for most sins even *without* repentance, and indeed, according to Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh, for all sins except apostasy.[7] The Gentiles are said to have committed a fatal and suicidal error in destroying the Altar, because it made atonement even *for them*, which was now

[1] Rosh Hashanah, f. 16, *a*.

[2] Yoma, f. 85, *b*; f. 86, *a* (Lev. xvi. 30). The reader will find a deeply interesting account of the Day of Atonement compiled from the Talmud (especially *Yoma*) in Hamburger, *s. v. Versöhnung*, and Mr. Hershon's *Treasures of the Talmud*, 89—114.

[3] Megillah, f. 23, *a*.

[4] For this they quoted Ps. lxviii. 28; Rosh Hashanah, f. 16, *b*.

[5] Kethuboth, f. 103, *b*.

[6] Bava Bathra, f. 121, *a*.

[7] Kerithoth, f. 7, *a*; Shevuoth, f. 13, *a*; Yoma, f. 86, *a*.

impossible.[1] Three books, it was said, are opened on New Year's Day—one for the perfectly wicked, one for the perfectly righteous, and one for the intermediate class. The first are sealed to death, and the second to life; the fate of the third is suspended till the Day of Atonement.[2]

Nothing could exceed the solicitude with which the High Priest was prepared for the sacred functions of the day. Seven days before it came he was removed from his own residence to the chamber of the President of the Sanhedrin, and he appointed a Sagan, or deputy, to act for him in case of his being incapacitated by any Levitic impurity. When the Elders of the Sanhedrin had read over to him the duties of the day, they said, "My Lord High Priest, read for thyself, read for thyself; perhaps thou hast forgotten, or never learnt it." On the day before, he was taken to the east gate, and with bullocks, rams, and lambs actually before him, was instructed what to do. Towards the dusk of the last evening he was only allowed to eat little, lest he should be sleepy. Then he was handed over to the senior priests, who swore him in, and said, "My Lord High Priest, we are the ambassadors of the Sanhedrin, and thou art our ambassador, and we adjure thee by Him who dwells in this house that thou wilt alter nothing that we have told thee." Then they parted, he and they both weeping; they

[1] Succah, f. 55, *b*. These and the preceding passages have been collected by Mr. Hershon in his interesting *Talmudic Miscellanies*.

[2] This information was furnished by Elijah the Tishbite to Rav Judah, and he proved it by Gematria as above (Yoma, f. 20, *a*). This treatise of the Talmud is devoted to the Day of Atonement. It is one of the earliest, and was written by Simeon of Mizpeh, a contemporary of Gamaliel the First (Derenbourg, p. 375, who refers to Peah, ii. 6; Yoma, 14, *b*).

because they suspected he was a Sadducee, and the penalty for wrongful suspicion was scourging; and he because they suspected him.[1] During the night, if he was a learned man, he preached or read to others; if not, they preached or read to him. The books read to him were Job, Ezra, Chronicles, and Daniel. If he became drowsy, the younger priests filliped their fingers before him, and said, "My Lord High Priest, stand up and cool thy feet upon the pavement." Thus they kept him engaged till the time of sacrifice, lest by chance any accidental defilement should spoil his propitiation. And so important was his ceremonial purity that if he was found performing the sacred duties in a state of defilement, the junior priests might drag him into the Hall of Paved Squares and brain him with clubs.[2] It may be safely said that, to the imagination of a Jew, the most solemn moment of the year was that in which the High Priest in his white robes stood alone before the Presence of God in the Holy of Holies; and that the proudest and gladdest moment of the year was that in which, awe-struck but safe, he came forth from the Holy Place in his golden garments to bless and to dismiss the forgiven worshippers.[3]

To the Mosaic ritual the Jews added many legendary particulars. They said, perhaps with reference to Isa. i. 18, that round the horns of the scapegoat which was to be "for Azazel," and round the neck of the goat "for Jehovah," was tied a tongue of scarlet cloth, and that if

[1] Yoma, f. 2, *a*; 18, *a*, *b*; 19, *b*. In the Herodian Temple the ark and mercy-seat were only *supposed* to be present. The sprinklings were made towards the stone of the foundation.

[2] Sanhedrin, f. 81, *b*.

[3] Further details of the ceremony of the Day of Atonement will be found in Excursus XII. "Ceremonies of the Day of Atonement."

the ceremonies of the day were accepted by God, then this tongue of scarlet was turned to white. They also asserted that, in order to secure that the scapegoat should not, with fatally evil omen, wander back to the congregation, it was sent by the hands of a trusty person to Zuk, some cliff in the wilderness, down which it was hurled backwards and killed.[1] The later Rabbis, echoing perhaps the mournful traditions of the last days of Jerusalem, told how, in the time of Simeon the Just, the lot for the Lord always fell on the right-hand[2] goat, and the tongue of scarlet always turned white; but forty years before the destruction of the Temple—a date which closely corresponds with the death of Christ—the lot did not fall on the right, nor the crimson cloth turn white, nor a light burn in the west. And the doors of the Temple opened of themselves, so that R. Jochanan Ben Zaccai rebuked them, and said, "O Temple, Temple, why art thou dismayed? I know thy end will be to be destroyed, for Zechariah, the son of Iddo, hath foretold concerning thee, 'Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.'"[3]

[1] Yoma, f. 66, *a*. There is no such provision in the Law. "Zuk" was to be 12½ miles from Jerusalem. See Hershon's *Treasures of the Talmud*, ch. vii.

[2] Lev. xvi. 8—10.

[3] Zech. xi. 1; Yoma, f. 29, *b*. Since the due fulfilment of the ceremonies of this great day has for 1,800 years been impossible to the Jews, the reader may be interested to see the melancholy folly into which its splendid ordinances have degenerated in the hands of the Polish Jews. It is now observed by what is called "The Atonement of the Cock." Since, in one passage of the Talmud, Gever (גבר) is used, not for "man," but for "cock" (Yoma, f. 20, *b*), modern Rabbis have invented the substitution of a cock for a man (Temurath Gever begever), and this custom has become a law according to the rule: "custom is as law." Fowls, and especially white cocks, are in great request on that day, as indicating that though the

They also regarded the function of the High Priest on this day as one of extreme peril. In his various confessions he had to pronounce ten times the Sacred Tetragrammaton—the ineffable name of Jehovah. The injunction never to enter the Holiest except on that one day of all the year had been laid on Aaron after the sudden death which had avenged the presumptuous irreverence of his two eldest sons, Nadab and Abihu; and the Jews said that if the High Priest entered the Holiest *five* times instead of the four which were actually necessary, he was slain by the wrath of God.[1] They even believed that many High Priests had perished on that day for neglect of the details which they swore to observe. During the whole ceremony the High Priest was alone in the Tabernacle. No Priest, until it was completed, was allowed to enter even into the Holy Place.[2] Hence the people, standing in the Court of Israel, waited with intense solicitude the reappearance of the High Priest through the outer veil. After his last entrance into the Holiest, he prayed in the Holy Place; and it was a special custom to make

sins of the man who kills it be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow. The legs of the cock are tied, and holding them in his hand, the Jew repeats the customary prayer. Then he swings the cock round and round his head with the words, "This is my substitute (*Chalaphathi*), my commutation (*Temarathi*), my atonement (*Kapparathi*)." Then the cock's neck is wrung, it is dashed on the ground, and its throat is cut, so that it undergoes (in a sense) the four Mosaic capital punishments of strangling, stoning, beheading, and burning. I borrow these, among other interesting particulars, from the *Jewish Herald* for July, 1880.

[1] Maimonides in Surenhusius, *Mishna*, ii. 232. See Lev. xvi. 2, 13. In the evening the High Priest gave a banquet to his friends to commemorate his safety. Perhaps it was the awe inspired by the ceremony which made the Sadducean High Priests of our Lord's day so willing to hand the office from one to another. See *Life of Christ*, ii. 342; Derenbourg, 234 *sq*.

[2] Lev. xvi. 17.

the prayer a short one, both from the awfulness of the solitude and in order that the apprehensions of the people might not be too painfully kindled by any long delay.[1]

Now the writer of the Epistle shows his fairness of spirit by taking this great ceremonial as his point of comparison, in order to give every advantage to the priesthood of which he wishes to prove the inferiority. He might have touched—a smaller man certainly would have touched—on the sacerdotal functions in their meaner, more trivial, more repellent aspect; but instead of this he takes the Aaronic Priesthood in the crown and flower of its loftiest ritual, and strives to warn the Christian converts from the peril of retrograding, by showing how the work and person of Christ transcend these seductive, but transitory and unsatisfying splendours. If the ritual of this day was, after all, a nullity, how great a nullity must be the other Levitical details! These High Priests were but provisional. From Aaron downwards their dignity had been dwarfed and overshadowed by the mysterious grandeur of Melchizedek. They were but priests; He who came to cancel their prerogatives was, like his antitype, a King as well as a Priest. They are for a time; He is for ever. They are but links in a long succession, each with many predecessors, each transmitting his office to his posterity; He stands alone, preceded by none, with no successor. They were established by an ordinance of Moses; He by the oath of God. They were sinful; He is innocent. They

[1] Yoma, iv. 7 (Surenhusius, *Mishna*, ii. 231). See Excursus XIII. "Impressions left on the Mind of the Jews by the Ceremonies of the Day of Atonement."

weak; He all-powerful. They had to offer "daily" sacrifices; He offered Himself once for all. They serve a Tabernacle which is but a copy and shadow of the True; He is a Minister of the Immaterial, the Ideal Tabernacle, Eternal in the Heavens. Their dispensation is declared to be Old; His is prophesied of as New and founded on better promises. They died and passed away; He sits for ever at the right hand of God still to make intercession for His people.

Further, the fact that even the Priests might not enter into the Holiest stamped with imperfection their whole ministration. The restriction proved that the priesthood could not perfect the worshipper as to his inmost life, since it was unable to lead him into the Presence-chamber of God. The whole Dispensation of which their ritual formed a part was necessarily provisional, consisting as it mainly did in matters relating to meats and drinks and washings—human ordinances, only imposed as preparatory to the season of their final rectification. The High Priest did indeed enter the Holiest with the blood of bulls and goats; but it was an exceptional privilege, not a right of continual and fearless access. The fact that it was necessary for him to make an atonement year after year, showed how little permanent was the effect of even that most solemn purification. And though he entered with awful precautions, so conscious were the people for whom he sacrificed that he was but a weak and sinful man, that they awaited his return in trembling suspense, lest by some sin or error he should provoke the wrath of God. Yet this was the system, this the central act of the system, to which Christians, heirs of privileges so infinitely greater, were

looking back with longing glances—to which some of them were even tempted to apostatise or retrogress! And what a retrogression! They were looking back to their petty Levitism, while Christ, the Mediator of a new, of a better, of a final dispensation—Christ, Whose death had made valid His Testament, Whose blood had a real and not a symbolic efficacy[1]—had died for all, and having died—not many times, but once for all, not as one of a long line, but Alone for all—not for Himself, because He did not need it—not as a sinful man, but as the sinless Son of God—not with the blood of calves and goats, but with His own blood—had entered not into a secondary and imitative tabernacle of perishable gold, but into one greater and more precious, and not made with hands! And so, passing for ever into the Immediate Presence of God, He had opened a way thither for all, obtaining an eternal redemption. And having thus with His own blood purified, not the earthly shadows of things, but even the heavenly things themselves, He would, at the consummation of the Ages, appear for salvation to those who were awaiting Him with feelings not of terror but of hope; He would appear, not as a sinful man, not even as bearing the sins of men, but apart from all sin, as the Everlasting Victor over all sin,

[1] The following passages illustrate the Jewish belief that there was "no remission without blood":—

"Abraham was circumcised on the Day of Atonement; and on that day God looks annually on the blood of the covenant of the circumcision as atoning for all our iniquities" (*Yalkut Kadash*, f. 121, *b*).

"R. Eliezer asked, 'For whose benefit were the seventy bullocks intended?' (Num. xxix. 12—36). The answer is, 'For the seventy nations of the Gentile world, to atone for them. . . . Woe to the Gentile nations for their loss and . . . they know not what they have lost; for as long as the Temple existed the Altar made Atonement for them; but now who is to atone for them?'" (*Succah*, f. 55, *b*).

with death and every other enemy laid prostrate beneath His feet.[1]

SECTION VI.

A RECAPITULATION.

It only remained for the writer to sum up his argument, which he does in the first eighteen verses of the following chapter. In these he dwells mainly on Christ's voluntary offering of Himself in obedience to the will of God, which he illustrates from Ps. xl. 6, 7;[2] on the one act of Christ's Redemption as contrasted with the many Levitic sacrifices;[3] and on Christ's finished work in accordance with the great prophecy of Jeremiah,[4] which he has already quoted.[5] And thus the leading thoughts of the argument are brought together in one grand finale, just as in the finale of a piece of music all the hitherto scattered elements are united in an effective whole.[6]

"For the Law having a shadow[7] of the good things to come,[8] not the very form[9] of the things—they can never,[10] with the same sacrifices, year by year, which they offer continuously, perfect (vii. 11, xi. 9) them that draw nigh (vii. 26). Since, in that case, would they

[1] See Jeremy Taylor's *Life of Christ*, iii. § 15. "He was arrayed with ornaments more glorious than the robes of Aaron. The crown of thorns was his mitre, the cross his pastoral staff . . . and his flesh rased and chequered with blue and blood instead of the parti-coloured robe."

[2] x. 1—10.

[3] x. 11—14.

[4] See viii. 8—12; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.

[5] x. 15—18.

[6] Delitzsch.

[7] viii. 5 (comp. Col. ii. 17): ἅ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[8] ix. 11.

[9] For other uses of the word, see 2 Cor. iv. 4, where Christ is called the εἰκὼν of God. "*Umbra* in Lege; *Imago* in Evangelio; *Veritas* in Coelo," S. Ambrose in Ps. xxxviii. (see 1 Cor. xiii. 12).

[10] The best supported reading seems to be δύνανται, and all the more

not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, purified once for all, would have had no more consciousness of sins? But in these sacrifices there is a calling to mind of sins year by year;[1] for it is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins.[2] Therefore, on entering into the world He saith,[3] 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,[4] but a body didst thou prepare for

because it is the more difficult reading, ℵ. A, C. But with this reading, the passage becomes an anakoluthon, and the κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν (if we accept the rendering of the E. V.) is very strangely placed (*hyperbaton*). To avoid this difficulty some explain it thus:—"They (the priests) can never, year by year, with the same sacrifices which they offer continuously, make them that draw nigh perfect." The meaning will then be that the priests cannot by the sacrifices of the Great Day of Atonement—which are after all but the *same* sin-offerings as they offer daily—perfect the worshippers. Yet another way of taking the words is to separate the κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς by commas, and render "can never perfect the comers by the sacrifices which they offer, which are the same year by year." So Bleek and De Wette. But after all it is not impossible that δύνανται may be a mere clerical error.

[1] See v. 3, and note on vii. 27. Here again, we find a striking resemblance to Philo, who speaks of the sacrifices providing "not an oblivion of sins, but a reminding of them" (*De Vict. Off.*, and *De Vit. Mos.* iii.). And again (*De plant. Noe*), he calls attention to Num. v. 15, where Moses speaks of the meat-offering of jealousy as being "a memorial meat-offering *bringing iniquity to remembrance*." The fact that the oft-repeated sacrifices thus *reminded* the worshipper of sins, and pointed daily to the means of their removal, and exercised his obedience in offering them, was the justification of their existence, although they were intrinsically without efficacy.

[2] Impossible that sacrifices should have this efficacy in themselves; they can only possess it *per accidens*, by faith, and because of the special grace of God attached to them. Even the Talmudists saw and said that the Day of Atonement itself was no remedy for, no expiation of, the willing sin which constantly defers repentance (Yoma, viii. 9).

[3] This remarkable quotation comes from Ps. xl. 6, 7. It is probably a Psalm of David, and although this passage is typically Messianic, other parts of the Psalm (*e.g.*, ver. 12) are almost exclusively personal. But yet the "He saith" means "Christ saith," because the words of David apply in a deeper and truer sense to Him.

[4] "Thou carest not for slain beast and bloodless oblation." This is one of the many memorable utterances of the Prophets, which show that they had been led to feel the nullity of sacrifices regarded as mere outward acts, and the vast superiority of a spiritual worship. It specially resembles 1 Sam. xv. 22, and anticipates the grand thoughts of Isaiah (i. 11—17);

me,[1] whole burnt offerings and sin-offerings thou approvedst not. Then I said, Lo, I have come (in the roll of the book it has been

Jeremiah (vi. 20; vii. 21—23); Hosea (vi. 6); Amos (v. 21—24); and, above all, Micah (vi. 6—8). Philo in a beautiful passage (*De plant. Noe*) shows how well he had caught the spirit of these prophetic passages, when he warns against the ignorant superstition which confounded the offering of sacrifices with the practice of piety, and against the fancy that sacrifices alone will cleanse from moral guilt. He adds that God accepts the innocent even when they offer no sacrifice, and delights in fireless altars round which the virtues dance.

[1] A remarkable variation of the LXX. from the Hebrew text, which literally is "*Ears hast thou digged for me.*" How did this variation arise? (i.) One supposition is that the LXX. followed a different reading, but this is now generally abandoned, as the attempts to alter the Hebrew text have been unsuccessful; and all other versions render the clause literally, showing that they had the present Hebrew text. (ii.) Nor is it very probable that the text of the LXX. is corrupt, though Usher and others have very ingeniously supposed that ΚΑΤΗΡΤΙΣΑΣΩΤΙΑ has got changed partly by homœoteleuton, and partly by mistaking ΤΙ for Μ, into ΚΑΤΗΡΤΙΣΑΣ ΣΩΜΑ; and the reading ὦτια is actually traceable in some manuscripts. (iii.) It is, however, more probable that the LXX. use their phrase as a sort of Targum, a way of explaining a Hebrew allusion which they perhaps thought would be unintelligible to Gentile readers. The next question is, How did they arrive at this sense? (α) A favourite explanation is, that the Hebrew expression alludes to the custom of boring the ear of a slave if he chose to remain in servitude (Ex. xxvi. 6; Deut. xv. 17), so that the bored ear would be a sign of willing obedience. But the verb means rather "digged" than "bored" (as in Ex. xxi. 6), and if this explanation were true we should expect "ear," not "ears." (β) It seems much more likely that the phrase "digging the ears," refers to opening the ears so that the soul may hear and obey—a metaphor found both in 1 Sam. xv. 22, and in Is. l. 5: "the Lord hath *opened the ear for me*, and I was not *rebellious*" (comp. Is. xlviii. 8). The meaning of the Psalmist will then be "thou hast revealed to me," or "caused me to hear so as to obey." The antithesis of the four clauses in the two verses of the Psalm is then perfect:—

> "Slain beast and bloodless oblation thou desiredst not.
> But mine ears thou diggedst.
> Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou requiredst not,
> Then said I, 'Lo! I have come to do thy will.'"

In the first clauses of each distich we have the sacrifices for which (comparatively, or in themselves) God does not care; in the second clauses the obedience for which He does care (see McCaul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, p. 162) In this sense then, the rendering of the LXX., though not a

written concerning me[1]) to do, O God, 'Thy will.'[2] Saying as above, 'Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings, and sin offerings, thou wouldest not, nor even approvedst (the which are offered according to the Law),[3] then He has said, 'Lo, I have come to do Thy will.' He takes away the first (namely, sacrifices) 'that He may establish the second' (namely, the Will of God). 'By which will we have been sanctified by the offering of the body (vs. 8, Rom. xii. 1) of Jesus Christ once for all.'

"And every High Priest,[4] indeed, standeth daily ministering, and offering often the same sacrifices, of a kind which are never able to strip away sins.[5] But He, after offering one sacrifice for sins for

translation, is an intelligible, though somewhat bold, paraphrase, the "body" apparently meaning "the form of a slave" (comp. Phil. ii. 7; Rev. xviii. 13). Finding the rendering in the LXX., believing it to represent the true sense of the original (as it does), and also seeing it to be eminently illustrative of his subject, the writer naturally adopts it. The suggestion of an ancient writer that it was he who altered the reading of the LXX. must be unhesitatingly rejected. The word "holocausts," or whole burnt-offerings, occurs here alone in this Epistle. They were the emblem of *entire* self-consecration (while the meat-offerings were eucharistic, and the sin-offerings expiatory). But the holocaust was valueless without the self-sacrifice of which it was the symbol.

[1] κεφαλὶς is properly the knob (*umbilicus*) of the roller on which the vellum was rolled. The LXX. chose it to represent the Hebrew *Megillah*. The writer probably did not stop to ask what book *David* was thinking of, because his mind is solely occupied with the Messianic application in which "the book" would be the whole Old Testament (Luke xxiv. 27). The words of the Psalm may mean "in the roll of the book it is prescribed to me," or as Gesenius and Ewald take it, "I am come with the volume of the book which is written for me." ἐν κεφαλίδι cannot mean "in the chief part" (Luther), or "in the beginning." David alludes to the writings of Moses, or possibly to the unwritten book of God's purposes (Ps. cxxxix. 16). The writer has omitted the words "I delight," before "to do Thy will." The sacred writers never aim at verbal accuracy in their quotations, since they did not hold any slavish and letter-worshipping theory of verbal inspiration. They hold it sufficient to give the general sense.

[2] x. 1—10 (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 3).

[3] The τὸν is omitted in ℵ, A, C.

[4] ἀρχιερεὺς (A. C.); ἱερεὺς, ℵ, D, E, K, L (B. ends at καθαριεῖ, in ix. 14). As to the *daily* offerings of the High Priest, see vii. 27, but the supposed difficulty may have led to the various reading. The "*standeth*" is emphatic. In the inner court none were allowed to sit, and the Levites are described as "*standing* before the face of the Lord."

[5] "To strip away"—sin being like a close-fitting robe (see on xii. 1).

ever, sat down at the right hand of God (vii. 27, viii. 1); henceforth awaiting until His enemies be placed as a footstool for His feet.[1] For by one offering He hath perfected (vii. 11, 25) for ever those who are in the way[2] of sanctification.[3]

"But the Holy Spirit also testifies to us. For after having said, 'This is the covenant which I will make with them after those days,' saith the Lord,[4] giving My Laws on their hearts, and upon their understandings will I inscribe them—and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no longer offering for sin."[5]

Those last words are the triumphant close of the argument. If the forgiveness, the removal, the obliteration of sin has been obtained, the object of all expiatory offerings has been accomplished, and they are rendered not only needless, but harmful—harmful as involving a faithlessness to Christ's finished work. If offerings are no longer admissible, there is an end of the Aaronic Priesthood; and if of the Priesthood, then also of the Law, which was based upon its existence; and if of the Law, then of the entire Old Dispensation. But if the Dispensation, which had long been depreciated by the voice of prophecy as "old," was now utterly vanishing

[1] See i. 13; Ps. cx. i.

[2] τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους; literally, "those who are being sanctified" (ii. 11). Sanctification is continuous, never instant and complete; but in the perfect sacrifice of Christ lies the germ of certain ultimate perfectionment for the believer (comp. τοὺς σωζομένους, Acts ii. 47).

[3] x. 11—14.

[4] The quotation is from Jer. xxxviii. 33, 34 (comp. viii. 10—12). To avoid the somewhat harsh form of the clause, the words ὕστερον λέγει, "Then He saith," are added before vi. 17 as the apodosis to μετὰ τὸ εἰρηκέναι. They are found in the Philoxenian Syriac, and were placed by Dr. Paris in the margin of the Cambridge Bible of 1762. There is no MS. or ms. authority for them, except the cursive 37. Others make these words "Saith the Lord," in ver. 16, *prospective*, and so the true apodosis. The question is not very important, being merely one of continuity of style.

[5] x. 15—18.

away, this could only be because, in accordance with that same sure word of prophecy, the New had been inaugurated. And the New was an abrogation of the Old, because it was as the substance to the shadow, as the picture to the sketch. It was founded on better promises; it had an Eternal High Priest; it needed no renewal: it looked with confidence to the fulfilment of illimitable hopes; it rejoiced in the admission into God's Presence, by virtue of the finished sacrifice and endless intercession of its King and Priest, its Divine Saviour and everlasting Lord.

To this conclusion the whole Epistle has been leading up. In the first six chapters, with many hortative and illustrative digressions, the writer has made good his opening words, that "God had in these last days revealed Himself to us in His Son." This he has done by showing Christ's superiority to angels, the mediators of the Old Covenant (i. 5, ii. 18), and to Moses, the appointed Lawgiver (iii. 1, iv. 16). Then, after showing the way in which Christ fulfilled the qualifications of High Priesthood, as a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek (v. 1—10), he enters on the solemn strain by which he designs to prepare the thoughts of his readers for due attention to his central argument (v. 11—vi. 20). That argument falls into three parts, namely—

(A) The superiority of Melchizedek's Priesthood, and therefore of the Priesthood of Christ, to that of Aaron in many particulars (vii. 1—28).

(B) The superiority of the ordinances of Christ's New Dispensation to those of the Old (viii. 1—ix. 28), with special reference to the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement.

(c) The final recapitulation and summary of the conclusions which he has set forth (x. 1—18).

SECTION VII.

A THIRD SOLEMN WARNING.

The main work of the writer is finished. He has set before the recent converts from Judaism incontrovertible reasons for holding fast that which they had received, and for not abandoning the better for the worse, the complete for the imperfect, the valid for the inefficient, the archetype for the cȏpy, the Eternal for the evanescent. It only remains for him to supplement the weight of reasoning by solemn warning and appeal. And this he does, first by an exhortation to faith, partly in the form of encouragement (x. 19—25), partly of warning (26—31); next, by a magnificent historic illustration of what faith is (xi.); lastly, by fervent exhortations to moral stedfastness and the holiness of the Christian walk (xii. 1—xiii. 19), ending by a few affectionate words of prayer and blessing.

The first burst of exhortation I proceed to translate, both because of its special solemnity and because it offers some difficulties of illustration and peculiarities of reading. The translation is offered not by any means as preferable to other versions, but as written with special objects. My aim is to follow (sometimes silently) what seems to me to be the best text; to avoid pages of discussion by only giving results; and to keep as nearly as possible to the form of the original Greek. In the notes I merely offer what seems to me to be most necessary for the elucidation of the text in the briefest form into which I can compress it.

"Having, then, confidence, brethren, in the blood of Jesus[1] for our entrance into the Holies—(an entrance) which He inaugurates for us as a fresh and a living road,[2] through the veil, that is His flesh[3]—and (having) a Great Priest[4] (set) over the House of God, let us approach with sincere heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water.[5] Let us hold fast the confession of our Hope[6] unwavering, for faithful is He who promised.[7] And let us consider one another for provocation[8] to love and good works, not deserting the assembling of ourselves together,[9] as is the custom

[1] These words go best with παῤῥησία (comp. Eph. iii. 12). It cannot be accurately said that *we* enter God's presence with the blood of Jesus, but He with His own blood (vi. 20; ix. 12).

[2] "New," ix. 8, 12; "Living," not in the sense of "life-giving" (Grotius, etc.), or "enduring" (Chrysostom), or "real," but because "He who liveth" is Himself the Way (John xiv. 6).

[3] As the veil hung between the Holy and the Holiest, so for a time the veil of flesh, *i.e.*, of suffering humanity, was the way through which Christ entered into the Holiest (see vi. 20); and His laying aside that veil of Flesh, and so, as it were, passing through it into Heaven, was symbolised by the rending of the *Parôketh* (see on chap. ix. 3), Matt. xxvii. 51.

[4] See iv. 14. By "a great Priest" (*cohen gadôl*, Lev. xxi.) is meant not only a High Priest, but "a Priest upon His throne," as in Zech. vi. 11—13.

[5] Comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25. The meaning is, "with our hearts sprinkled, as it were, with the blood of Christ (xii. 24; ix. 14; 1 Pet. i. 2), and so cleansed from a conscience which has become depraved, and our whole beings cleansed in the waters of baptism" (Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21), just as the Jewish priests were sprinkled with blood (Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30), and bathed (Ex. xxx. 20); Lev. viii. 6; xvi. 4) before they could enter the Holy Places; ἐῤῥαντισμένοι . . . λελουμένοι, "sprinkled . . . washed, once and for ever." For all Christians are priests (Rev. i. 5, 6).

[6] See vi. 11, 18, 19. Here, by a very singular oversight, our version has "the profession of our *faith*." We have "Faith" in ver. 22; "Hope" here; and "Love" in ver. 24. In this, as throughout the Epistle, we recognise the friend and pupil of St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. i. 3; Col. i. 4, etc.).

[7] See vi. 13; xi. 11; xii. 26; 1 Thess. v. 24; 1 Cor. i. 9.

[8] Παροξυσμὸς is generally used in a bad sense, like "provocation;" and perhaps he uses the word because there had been among them a *paroxusmos* of hatred and not of love.

[9] Namely, in Christian gatherings for worship and Holy Communion. Ἐπισυναγωγὴ is only found in 1 Thess. ii. 1, and Delitzsch thinks that the word is here selected to avoid the Jewish συναγωγή; for the Jews also were stringent in requiring this duty (Berachoth, f. 8, *a*).

with some,[1] but encouraging one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching.[2]

For if we sin willingly[3] after the receiving of the full knowledge of the truth,[4] there is no longer left a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectance of judgment,[5] and a jealousy of fire which is about to devour the adversaries.[6] Any one who set at nought Moses' Law is without compassion put to death on the testimony of two or three witnesses; of how much worse vengeance,[7] think ye, shall he

[1] In this neglectfulness he saw the dangerous germ of apostasy.

[2] x. 19—25. The day is the Last Day when Time, as counted by days, shall end (1 Cor. iii. 13). That Day, as regards the Old Covenant, came within a few years of this time at the fall of Jerusalem, which was God's judgment on the Judaism which refused to recognise its own Divine annulment. And that Day of the Lord was "the bloody and fiery dawn" of the Last Great Day (Matt. xvi. 28; xxiv; Luke xvii.).

[3] The whole of this striking clause of warning closely resembles the passage on vi. 4—8, where see the notes. It contemplates not the ordinary sins and shortcomings of human frailty (ἀσθένεια . . . ἀγνοοῦντες . . . πλανώμενοι, v. 2), which may be forgiven upon repentance, but the last extreme of deliberate and self-chosen wickedness in those who say "Evil, be thou my good," and who thus close the door of repentance against themselves, by passing from the spiritual life into impenitent and determined apostasy; and it contemplates this state as continued till "the Day" comes. The warning is against tendencies so perilous that they might end in a state of sin which deliberately despised and rejected its Saviour.

[4] Ἐπίγνωσις—not a mere historical knowledge of the truth, but some advance in that knowledge—a recognition of the truth at once theoretical and practical. He is speaking, not of lip-Christians, but of converts who lapse into "wretchlessness of unclean living." The passage has nothing directly to do with the Novatian dispute about the possibility of a second baptism. Nor does it say that the sinner has exhausted the infinitude of God's forgiveness, but only that there is no other sacrifice for sin left for him except that which he has willingly rejected.

[5] The τις is intensive.

[6] See Is. xxvi. 11. He personifies the fire, because the same thought is in his mind which he expresses in xii. 29. Perhaps, too, he is referring to such passages as Ps. lxxix. 5, "Shall thy jealousy burn like fire?" (Ezek. xxxvi. 5, etc.) The fire of God's wrath is that which was soon to devour the whole existence of Judaism. The New Testament writers are often alluding primarily to *these* consequences with none of those further allusions which have been introduced into the interpretation of their language.

[7] Deut. xvii. 2—7, where the sin to be punished is idolatry. This is the *only* passage in the New Testament where τιμωρία—which properly means retributive or vindictive punishment—is used of God. The word "punish-

be deemed worthy who has trampled under foot the Son of God, and considered the blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified a common thing, and insulted the Spirit of Grace?[1] For we know Him who said Retribution is Mine; I will repay, saith the Lord;[2] and again, The Lord shall judge His people.[3] Fearful is it to[4] fall into the hands of the Living God" (x. 19—31).

ment" is elsewhere κόλασις, which properly means "remedial punishment." It must be borne in mind that (1) it is here applied to the worst, deadliest, and most impenitent apostates; and (2) that its immediate reference is to to the Day of Christ's coming, which was so close at hand in the temporal overthrow of the Jewish polity (Ewald, *Sendschr. an d. Hebr.* p. 122).

[1] It is clear that no more violent extremity of sin—no nearer approach to the unpardonable sin, the sin against the Holy Ghost—can be described than that which is contemplated in these verses. By "a *common* thing" may be meant either "unclean" (Vulg., Luther, etc.) or "of no specific value" (Theophyl., etc.)

[2] He quotes this text to show that his warnings are founded on Scripture warrant. The reference is to Deut. xxxii. 35, but it exactly follows neither the Hebrew ("To me [is] vengeance and recompense") nor the LXX. ("in the day of retribution I will requite"). It *is* exactly identical with St. Paul's citation of the same verse in Rom. xii. 19. especially if "saith the Lord" is here genuine (which is, however, omitted by א, D, and several versions and Fathers). An argument has been drawn from this fact that St. Paul must be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but this argument is untenable, because (1) it is universally admitted that the writer was a friend and follower of St. Paul, and familiar with his phraseology and method of thought; (2) he may very possibly have had the Epistle to the Romans in his hands, especially as in xiii. 1—6 he shows traces of Rom. xii. 1—21 (see Alford, *Introd.* p. 71); and (3) the quotation in this very form, or one which nearly resembles it, seems to have been current in the Jewish schools, for it is found in the Targum of Onkelos. The reference to Deuteronomy shows that he is thinking mainly of *national* punishments.

[3] The primary sense of these words in Deut. xxxii. 36, "The Lord will deliver His people as a righteous Judge;" but judgment involves both acquittal and condemnation, and the deliverance of the Jews meant the overthrow of their enemies.

[4] Here again the *stern* aspect of "falling into the hands of God" is given—the aspect which it bears "for the apostate and covenant-breaker" who has deliberately rejected and defied God. For the penitent sinner there is another aspect. David, expecting and bowing to just punishment, yet says (1 Chr. xxi. 13), "Let *me fall now into the hand of the Lord*; for very great are His mercies: but let me not fall into the hand of man."

"But recall the former days[1] in which, after being enlightened,[2] ye endured much struggle of sufferings, partly by being made a public spectacle[3] in reproaches and afflictions, and partly by becoming partakers with those who were thus treated. For indeed ye sympathised with the prisoners,[4] and ye accepted with joy the plundering of your possessions,[5] recognising that ye have *yourselves*[6] as a better possession and an enduring. Fling not away, then, your confidence, since it has[7] a great recompense of reward. For ye have need of endurance, in order that, by doing the will of God, ye may win the promise. For yet but a very, very little while,[8] He who cometh will have come, and will not tarry.[9] 'But my righteous one shall live by

And the son of Sirach, referring to the same passage, says (Ecclus. ii. 18), "We will fall into the hands of the Lord, and not into the hands of men; for as His majesty is, so is His mercy." Some would render it of "a *living* God" (comp. iii. 12); and this may be right, because there is a silent reference to Deut. xxxii. 40.

[1] Here, as in vi. 9—12, he passes from warning to encouragement, and bids them imitate their former and better selves.

[2] This word is not a mere synonym for "when ye were baptised" (see on vi. 4).

[3] The same metaphor as in 1 Cor. iv. 9; xv. 32.

[4] The common reading is τοῖς δέσμοῖς μου, "with my chains;" and this has been one of the circumstances which have led to the identification of the author with St. Paul. But this reading may easily have crept in from Col. iv. 18; Phil. i. 7, etc., and δεσμίοις, "with the prisoners," is the reading of A, D, the Vulgate, Syriac, and Coptic versions, St. Chrysostom, etc., and is strongly supported by xiii. 3. It also suggests fewer historical difficulties.

[5] There is a very striking parallel in Epictetus—"I became poor at Thy will, yea and gladly."

[6] I here follow the very striking and beautiful reading of ℵ, A, which suggests the same great spiritual truth as ver. 39 and Luke ix. 25, xxi. 19. If ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, the very ill-supported reading of our text, be followed, the true translation will even then be, not (as in our version) "knowing in yourselves that," but "knowing that *you have in yourselves*," *i.e.*, in your own hearts, or omitting the ἐν with A, D, E, K, L, "*for* yourselves." The "in Heaven" must in any case be omitted as a gloss (ℵ, A, D, etc.).

[7] ἥτις, *quippe quae.*

[8] μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον. This forcible phrase is borrowed from LXX. Is. xxvi. 20.

[9] The quotation is an adaptation of the words of Hab. ii. 3, 4. For a fuller consideration of it, as it occurs in Gal. iii. 11, Rom. i. 17, see my *Life of St. Paul*, i. 369. The μοῦ ("*my* just man") is weakly supported by MS. authority, being only found in ℵ, A; but the fact that it is *not* found

faith,' and 'if he[1] draw back My soul approveth him not.' But we are not of defection unto perdition, but of faith unto the gaining of the soul "[2] (x. 32—39).

We are not of defection unto perdition—we do not belong to the party of those who have passed over the verge of apostasy, to the ruin of their souls; "but we are of FAITH to the salvation of the soul." What, then, is Faith?

SECTION VIII.

THE GLORIES OF FAITH.

By his mention of the word FAITH in this climax of exhortation, the writer, with the skill of a great orator, prepares the way for the enumeration of the heroes of faith in the next chapter. And this muster roll of the elders of the Jewish Church is by no means intended only as a series of good examples. It serves a more powerful end. It shows the Jewish converts, who were in danger of relapsing into their old bondage,

in the two citations by St. Paul makes it more probable that it is genuine here. In the original it is "*the vision*" which will soon come. The Rabbis said that into this one precept as to the saving nature of faith, Habakkuk has compressed the 365 negative and the 248 positive precepts of the Law, which David had reduced to 11 (Ps. xv. 1—5), Isaiah to 6 (Is. xxxiii. 15), Micah to 3 (Mic. vi. 8), Isaiah again to 2 (Is. lvi. 1), and Amos, as well as Habakkuk, to 1 (Amos v. 4) (*Maccoth*, f. 23, *b*; f. 24, *a*).

[1] "If he," *i.e.*, "if my just man." The E. V. inserts "if *any man*," but this is not warrantable, and as it is only found in the Genevan Version, there is some reason to fear that this is one of the very rare instances in which our translators have yielded to the temptation of dogmatic bias. But the belief that "the just" *may* fall back runs throughout the Epistle. There is not in it a single trace of the notion of "indefectible grace," or of "final perseverance."

[2] For this word ὑποστείληται see Acts xx. 20, 27; Gal. ii. 12. In these words the LXX. diverge widely from the Hebrew, which means "Behold his soul is lifted up, it is not upright in him"—words which seem to refer to the haughty Chaldean invader. The word rendered "faith" means, in the language of the Prophet, primarily "faithfulness."

that there was no painful discontinuity in their religious life; no harsh break between their present hopes and the past history of their race. The past was not discarded and disgraced; it was fulfilled and glorified. So far from being dissevered from the gracious lives of the Patriarchs, and the splendid zeal of the Prophets, they were infinitely nearer to them as Christians than they could have been as Jews. They were in possession of the mystery on which the elders had gazed with longing eyes, and were better able than their unconverted brethren to understand the inmost heart of their fathers. Physical descent, and identity of worship, could not enable them to know the meaning of the faith displayed in the ante-Diluvian, the Patriarchal, and the Mosaic days. But Faith in Christ was the sun-like centre of all the types, and symbols, and sacrifices, and promises which constituted the religion of the Chosen People until Christ came.

What, then, is faith?

It is nowhere defined in Scripture, and the famous words with which this chapter opens are not so much a definition as a description. They are not a definition, for they do not, as St. Thomas Aquinas says, indicate the essence of Faith. They tell us what Faith *does*, rather than what it *is*—its *issues*, rather than its nature. "Faith," the writer says, "is the basis of things hoped for,[1] the demonstration of objects not

[1] *ὑπόστασις*. This word "*hypostasis*" occurs only in 2 Cor. ix. 4; xi. 17 ("confident boasting"); Heb. i. 3 ("substance"); iii. 14 ("confidence"). Here it has been variously understood to mean (1) the "substance," in the metaphysical sense; that unseen substance in which all properties of a thing cohere; that which "*stands under*" all the visible or sensible qualities of a thing—its essence; that, therefore, which alone gives it reality. Thus among others Theophylact, who calls it the *οὐσίωσις τῶν μήπω ὄντων καὶ*

seen."[1] This is what faith is in its results. It furnishes us with a foundation on which our hopes can securely rest, and with a conviction that those things exist which are not earthly or temporal, and which, therefore, we cannot see. Faith itself—not in the highest Pauline sense, but in its more usual sense[2] —is the spiritual power by which we are enabled to occupy this sure foundation, and arrive at this firm persuasion. It is the hand stretched forth into that Holiest Place which is as yet hidden from us by the veil of sense—the hand which can hold the spiritual gifts of God with so sure a grasp that it can never be deprived of them. To the eye of Faith the unseen

ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὑφεστώτων, and Ewald ("*Bestand in dem was man hofft*"). It would thus mean the cause of the subjective reality of things hoped for; or, as Dr. Moulton says, "the *giving substance* to them;" or (2) "*confidence*"; or (3) as understood by Luther, Grotius, Bleek, Delitzsch, De Wette, Ebrard, Lunemann, &c., "*foundation.*" This latter rendering seems to me the best. It is true that it is not the meaning of the word in iii. 14, nor i. 3, and the LXX. use it for "standing" in Ps. lxix. 2 (see Dante, *Paradiso*, xxiv. 52—81). St. Jerome says that this clause "breathes somewhat of Philo," who similarly speaks of "faith as dependent on a gracious hope, and regarding things not present as being indubitably present," and as "the fulness of excellent hopes . . . the lot of happiness . . . the sole genuine and secure blessing."

[1] If we could render the word "inward conviction," it would give a more forcible sense, and perhaps this is implied, though the word usually bears the more objective meaning of "demonstration." The use of the word πραγμάτων in this clause seems to imply that Faith not only makes Hope seem to rest on a basis of actual fruition, but also demonstrates the existence of the immaterial as clearly as though it were material. Ewald renders it, "Es ist aber Glaube. . . Beweis für Dinge welche man nicht schauet."

[2] For the distinctions in the meaning of Faith, see *supra*, p. 312, and my *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 188, *sq*. Here the writer uses the word, not in its specifically Christian sense (Gal. ii. 16; iii. 26; Rom. iii. 24), but in its general Old Testament sense of faithfulness resulting from trust in God (Gen. xv. 6, &c.), as also sometimes in St. Paul (2 Cor. v. 7; Rom. viii. 24—25). In this sense it is the hope which, without seeing, holds the ideal to be the real (Immer, *New. Test. Theol*. p. 413).

and the eternal are more real than the things seen and temporal. To the heart of Faith hopes are as actual as realities, and heavenly promises are more precious than earthly possessions. To the eyes of the unilluminated heart the region in which Faith lives and moves is a dark cavern where nothing is even visible, much less can anything be beautiful; but Faith carries in her hand a lamp, kindled with light from Heaven, and wherever she moves an atmosphere of light is shed around her, and under every ray of it the streets and walls of the New Jerusalem seem to flash as with innumerable gems.

It was then a great encouragement and safeguard for these recent converts to know that it was by Faith that the elders[1] obtained a good report—that they, too, had to walk by Faith, and not by sight, and that the object of Faith was the same then as now, with this only difference, that then it was dim and unrevealed, but now was made fully manifest. For the object of the faith of the righteous—even from the days in which it had been promised in Paradise that the seed of the woman should break the serpent's head—was none other than the Christ. To the ancients He had been known solely under the guise of type and shadow, but now He was set forth to all as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person.

But before beginning his list of worthies, he says,

"By faith we perceive that the ages[2] have been established by

[1] By the elders is not meant merely "the ancients," but the *Zekênim*, the greatest and best men of past ages (Is. xxiv. 22, &c.). "One who is in truth an elder is regarded," says Philo, "not in distance of time, but in worthiness of life" (*De Abraham*, § 46).

[2] See Philo, *De Monarch.* ii. p. 823; *Leg. allegg.* iii. p. 79; *De Cherub.* i. p. 162 (ed. Mangey), where the Logos is the Instrument of Creation.

the utterance of God,[1] so that not from things which appear hath that which is seen come into being"[2] (xi. 3).

It is a mistake to regard this verse as incongruous with those which follow, or as introducing a different line of illustration from them. On the contrary, it strikes the keynote of all faith. Faith can only take its origin from the belief in God as the Creator of the Universe, and of the very substance from which the material Universe is made, so as to exclude all semi-Manichæan conceptions of the Eternity of matter. We cannot believe in Christ, the end of our Faith, nor can we in any way understand His work, until we have learnt to believe in God as the Infinite Creator of all things visible and invisible. And this belief was, from the dawn of Humanity, the foundation of all holiness. Like the first chapter of Genesis, the

οἱ αἰῶνες, עולמים ("the ages"), is the world regarded in its history, regarded as existing in time. It differs from "the Universe" (κόσμος), which is the world regarded in its material aspect (see the quotation from the Talmud in Gesenius, *Thes. II.* 1056). This expression, therefore, includes the moral government of the world, as well as its creation (see i. 2); "the invisible, spiritual, and permanent potencies of the phenomenal world which owe their origin to the Son of God" (Möll).

[1] It is hardly to be doubted that the writer means no more here than that "God spake, and it was done" (λέγων ἅμα ἐποίει—Philo, *De Sacr. Abel et Cain,* § 18). Had he meant to imply that God created the world by the Divine Logos, he would have used the word λόγῳ, not ῥήματι, especially as the LXX. use it in Ps. xxxii. 6. Even in iv. 12, it is more than doubtful whether Logos bears its technical sense.

[2] I read τὸ βλεπόμενον with א, A, D, E. The wording of the phrase and its meaning may seem harsher than the rendering of the E. V., but it is the only rendering of which the order of the Greek admits, and the meaning is that "the visible world did not derive its origin from anything phenomenal"—in other words, that there was no pre-existent matter from which God made the world—not even the wild waste, "thohu va-bohu," of the chaos mentioned in Gen. i. 2. The meaning then, is practically identical with 2 Macc. vii. 28 (reading ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), "I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and earth, and all that is therein, and consider that *God made them of things that were not.*"

verse is meant to exclude from the region of faith all Atheism, Pantheism, Dualism, or Polytheism, and to fix the soul on the thought of the One True God.

Then he begins to adduce his handful of illustrations—"plucking, so to speak, only the flowers which stand by his way, and leaving the whole meadow full to his readers."[1] And he first culls examples from the antediluvian days to show that the Faith which Christ required was analogous to the Faith which had worked in every holy soul since the world began.

It was by faith, then, that Abel offered to God a sacrifice which was "more than that of Cain,"[2] and was borne witness to as being Righteous[3]—since God bore witness respecting his gifts, and so, by his faith, he though dead yet speaketh.[4] It was by faith that Enoch was removed hence,[5] because he had that faith both in God's Being and in His Divine government of the world, without which it is impossible to please Him. By faith Noah built the Ark, and became an heir of

[1] Delitzsch. The chapter falls into five groups of instances:—(i.) Antediluvians (4—6); (ii.) from Noah to Abraham (7—13). Then follows a general reflexion (13—16); (iii.) Abraham and the Patriarchs; (iv.) from Moses to Rahab; (v.) summary reference to later heroes and martyrs down to the time of the Maccabees (32—40).

[2] Ver. 4. πλείονα παρὰ Κάϊν (comp. iii. 3; Matt. vi. 25). The exact point in which the sacrifice of Abel was superior to Cain's is left uncertain, though not difficult to conjecture.

[3] By God's approval of his sacrifice (Gen. iv. 4). He is called "righteous" in Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 John iii. 12.

[4] Primarily, an allusion to "the voice of his blood" (Gen. iv. 10), as seems probable from xii. 24, but hardly excluding the wider sense, in which it is so often quoted, of "speaking by his example." Another reading is λαλεῖται (D), "is spoken of"; but here, again, the writer seems to be thinking of a passage of Philo, where he says that "Abel—which is most strange—has both been slain, and lives," which he deduces from Gen. iv. 8—10 (*Opp.* i. 200, ed. Mangey).

[5] xi. 5, μετετέθη; lit., "he was transferred" (Gen. v. 24).

the Righteousness which is according to faith.[1] By faith Abraham, when called by God,[2] left his home in Ur of the Chaldees to wander as a nomad Sheikh in a land not yet his own, awaiting the city that hath the foundations[3] whose architect and framer was God.[4] By faith even Sarah[5] became a mother of him from whom sprang people numberless as the sand along the lip of the sea.[6] The death of all these resembled their lives, for they all died in accordance with faith, not having received the (fruition of the) promises made to them,[7] but having seen that fruition from afar, and

[1] Noah is called Righteous (*tsaddîk*, δίκαιος) in Gen. vi. 9; and, as Philo observes, he is the first to whom the title is given in Scripture. He is mistaken in making the *name* Noah mean righteous (*Leg. allegg.* iii. 24). The "righteousness *according to* faith," is a very Pauline-sounding phrase, though St. Paul never actually uses it. He uses, however, "the righteousness *of* faith" (Rom. iv. 13). The phrase could hardly have been used by one unfamiliar with St. Paul's terminology; but the writer shows his own marked individuality by applying both words, "Righteousness" and "Faith," in a sense by no means identical with that of St. Paul, but strongly marked with his own views (see *supra*, pp. 312, 313).

[2] Ver. 8. I read καλούμενος with most uncials. If, however, ὁ κ. be the right reading (A, D), the meaning can only be "he who was called Abraham," with a reference to the change of his name from Abram. This is by no means impossible (so Theodoret). The faith of Abraham was one of the commonest topics of eulogy and discussion in the Rabbinic schools.

[3] Ver. 10. Not Jerusalem (Ps. xlvi. 5; lxxxvii. 1: Rev. xxi. 10), but "the Jerusalem above" (xii. 22; xiii. 14). The same thought and expression occurs often in Philo.

[4] Philo in several places speaks of God as the Architect (τεχνίτης) of the world; and this is one of the resemblances of this Epistle to the Book of Wisdom (Wisd. xiii. 1).

[5] *Even* Sarah, though once she laughed.

[6] Dr. Field seems to think that καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα may be a gloss: for (i.) ἔτεκεν is not found in ℵ, A, D; (ii.) from the reference to *Abraham* in Rom. iv. 8; (iii.) because καταβολὴ properly applies to the male.

[7] They had received the promises in one sense (ἐκομίσαντο), but not in another (οὐ λαβόντες). See ix. 15.

greeted it,[1] and acknowledged that human life is but a sojourn in an alien country.[2] Such language showed clearly that they were looking for a fatherland; and this was not the land which they had left, for, had this been all, they could easily have returned to it. But they were yearning for a better—a heavenly country; and because they were thus homesick their Father was not ashamed of them, not ashamed to be entitled their God (Gen. xvii. 7; xxvi. 24; xxviii. 13, etc.), for He prepared for them a city.

Then, returning to Abraham, he dwells on the faith he showed in the willingness to offer up his son, his only son, whom in *will* he so absolutely sacrificed that, typically speaking,[3] he received him back only from the dead. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, even respecting things future.[4] By faith Jacob on his death-

[1] See Gen. xlix. 19; John viii. 56.

[2] Gen. xxiii. 4; xlvii. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 15; Ps. xxxix. 12, &c.

[3] Ver. 19. Elsewhere in the Epistle ὅθεν means "for which reason." The meaning of the words ἐν παραβολῇ has been much disputed. (1) Some take it to mean "unexpectedly" (as in Polybius, i. 23, παραβόλως), or "in bold venture," on the analogy of παραβάλλεσθαι—"to undertake *a daring risk.*" (2) Luther erroneously follows the Vulg. in rendering them "for a type" (*in parabolam, zum Vorbilde*). There is, however, no doubt that it must mean (3) "in a figure," as in our E. V. But the question then arises how he can be said to have received Isaac back "in a figure," and not in reality? Omitting untenable conjectures, it may mean either "as a type of the resurrection," or be taken as a qualification of the 'received him from the dead." Isaac was, "*figuratively speaking, dead*" when Abraham received him back. The form of expression is unusual, but the Jewish analogies seem to show that this is the meaning here. (See the passages quoted by Wetstein,—in one of them—Pirke Eliezer, § 31—it is said that Isaac did actually die; and see Rom. iv. 17—19.)

[4] Esau too was blessed. He got the lower life that he desired, though the true rendering of Gen. xxvii. 39 is not as in our Version, but "Behold, thy dwelling shall be *away from* the fatness of the earth, and *away from* the dew of blessing."

bed blessed each of the sons of Joseph,[1] and bowed his head to God as he leaned over the top of his staff.[2] By faith Joseph felt so sure that God would fulfil His promises that he bade the children of Israel carry back his bones with them from Egypt to the Promised Land.[3] By faith Amram and Jochebed, the parents of Moses, struck with his beauty,[4] fearlessly hid him for three months. By faith Moses when he grew up, undazzled by the rank and splendour of the Egyptian throne,[5] turned away his eyes to the great reward, deliberately preferring to share in the reproach of the Christ[6] with God's suffering people. By faith, with his eyes still steadfastly fixed on the *unseen* King, he braved the wrath of Pharaoh, and led his people out of Egypt.[7]

[1] See Gen. xlviii. 14, 17—20.

[2] This seems to refer, not to the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, but to Gen. xlvii. 31. In our Version it runs, "And Israel bowed himself upon his bed's head." The LXX. and Peshito render it as here, "upon the top of his staff;" and the strange rendering of the Vulgate, "He (Jacob) adored the head of his (Joseph's) staff," has led to the wildest vagaries of conjecture, and to the defence of image-worship from this passage! The main variation of rendering arises only from the fact that the LXX., Vulgate, and Peshito understood the word to be *matteh*, "staff," not *mittah*, "bed," as they understood it two verses later (Gen. xlviii. 2). Jacob was lying in bed, but, getting up to take the oath from Joseph, supported his trembling limbs upon "the staff," which was a memorable type of his pilgrimage (Gen. xxxii. 10), and, at the end of the oath, bowed his head over his staff in sign of thanks and reverence to God.

[3] Gen. l. 26; Ex. xiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32.

[4] Acts vii. 20, "fair to God." His Divine beauty seemed to them a sign of something remarkable. See Philo, *Vit. Mos.* (*Opp.* ii. 82).

[5] "The son of a daughter of Pharaoh," *i.e.*, the son of a princess. The reference is to the Jewish legend, which was peculiarly rich in details about Moses. It is not recorded in Scripture, though it is implied. Comp. Lk. iv. 5, 6.

[6] See xiii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 5; Col. i. 24. "The reproach which Christ had to bear in His own person, and has to bear in that of His members" (Bleek). There is probably a reference to Ps. lxxxix. 50, 51. Comp. Phil. iii. 7—11.

[7] This clearly alludes to the Exodus. If it alluded to his flight into

By faith he celebrated[1] the Passover and the sprinkling of blood that the Destroyer of the firstborn might not touch them. By faith the Israelites crossed the Red Sea as through dry land. It was by their faith that the walls of Jericho fell. It was faith[2] which led Rahab, the heathen harlot,[3] to receive their spies. And after these many examples of heroic faith exhibited in many particulars—Abel, Enoch, Noah—Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, the parents of Moses—Moses, the Israelites, Rahab—what need was there to continue[4] the glorious enumeration, and go through the deeds of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel, and the Prophets—

"Who, through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness,[5] obtained promises,[6] stopped the mouths of lions,[7] quenched the power of fire,[8] escaped the edges of the sword,[9] were strengthened out of weakness,[10] became mighty in war, drove back the armies of the aliens.[11] Women received their dead by resurrection,[12] and others

Midian, it would require some violence to harmonise it with Ex. ii. 14. It is true that for the moment Pharaoh consented to the Exodus, but it was only in wrath and fear, and it was certain that he would pursue them.

[1] For the perfect see ver. 17, and the notes on iv. 7, ix. 8, x. 9, x. 28, &c.

[2] It is equally true, in another sense, that it was by works. Jas. ii. 25.

[3] The word is to be understood literally (Matt. i. 5), and its retention is a proof of the faithfulness of the sacred narrative, even in matters most likely to wound the national sensibilities of the Jews. The Targum softens it down into *Pundakitha* = πανδοκευτρία, *cauponaria*, "inn-keeper," and Braune most arbitrarily renders it "idolatress."

[4] The phrase, "time will fail me," is found also in Philo (*De somn.*).

[5] A proof that the writer never dreamt, any more than St. Paul did, of an inoperative faith.

[6] The allusion is to the promises of victory, &c., of Josh. xxi. 45, &c. (Comp. ver. 13, 39.)

[7] Dan. vi. 23; Judg. xiv. 6; 2 Sam. xvii. 34; xxiii. 20.

[8] Dan. iii. "the burning fiery furnace."

[9] 1 Sam. xviii. 11; xix. 10, 12; 2 Kings iv. 14; &c. &c.

[10] Samson, David, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezra, &c.

[11] These two clauses seem to refer to the Maccabees.

[12] 1 Kings xvii. 22, 23 2 Kings iv. 35—37.

were broken on the wheel,[1] not accepting the offered deliverance, that they may obtain a better resurrection.[2] Others again bore trial of mockings and scourgings,[3] aye, and further of chains and imprisonment;[4] they were stoned,[5] were sawn asunder,[6] were tempted,[7] died by slaughter of the sword.[8] They went about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented—of whom the world was not worthy—wandering in deserts and mountains, and caves and the clefts of the earth.[9] And these all, being borne witness to by their faith, received not the promise,[10] since God provided something better concerning us,[11] in order that they may not, apart from us, be perfected"[12] (xi. 33—40).

SECTION IX.

FINAL EXHORTATIONS.

He can now resume with added force his final exhortation to faithful endurance. They are running a

[1] This is the technical meaning of the word, and is probably intended here, if the reference is to 2 Macc. vi. 18—30, and vii.

[2] Not a resurrection like that of the son of the Shunamite and the woman of Sarepta. See 2 Macc. vii. 9—36.

[3] 2 Macc. vii. 7—10; 1 Macc. ix. 26; Jos. *Antt.* xii. 5, § 4.

[4] 1 Macc. xii. 12; and in the Old Testament, Micah; 1 Kings xxiii. 26; Jer. xxxii. 23, &c.

[5] See 2 Chron. xxiv. 20—22; Matt. xxiii. 35—37. Tradition said that Jeremiah was stoned.

[6] Isaiah was perhaps sawn asunder. (See Yevamoth, f. 49 *b*; Sanhedrin, f. 103 *b*; Hamburger, *Talm. Wört. s. v.* Jesaia.)

[7] Comp. Matt. xxiv. 51. As the prophet from Judah was by Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiii. 7. If the reading be correct, it can only imply that the temptation to apostatise was the most cruel of afflictions (comp. Acts xxvi. 11; *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 172). But ἐπρήσθησαν, "they were burned," would be a probable conjecture if there were the slightest variation in the MSS. Comp. Philo, *in Flacc.* 20, where he tells us that some Jews of Alexandria were burned alive. (See 2 Macc. vi. 11).

[8] 1 Kings xix. 10; Jer. xxvi. 23; 1 Macc. ii. 38; 2 Macc. v. 26.

[9] Judg. vi. 2; 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13; xix. 8, 13; 1 Macc. ii. 28, 29; 2 Macc. v. 27; vi. 11; x. 6; Matt. xiv. 10.

[10] See ix. 15. If this be the right reading, we must suppose a contrast between general promises (xi. 33) and the one great final promise. But A reads "promises," and this is followed by some of the Fathers. (Comp. vi. 15.)

[11] Matt. xiii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. [12] 1 Thess. i. 10; Rev. xxi. 3, 4.

race, they are fighting a battle, but they are not alone. They are successors of the old saints, united with them in sympathy, but endowed with even richer blessings and inspired with more glorious hopes.

"Wherefore let us also, since we have on all sides around us so great a cloud of witnesses (to the faith),[1] laying aside every weight[2] and the closely-clinging sin,[3] let us run with patience the race set before us, gazing earnestly on the leader[4] and perfecter of our faith, Jesus, who for the joy set before him endured a cross, despising shame, and has sat down on the right hand of the throne of God. For compare yourselves with him who hath endured such contradiction at the hands of sinners against himself,[5] that ye be not weary by fainting in your souls. Not yet unto blood did ye resist in your struggles against sin,[6] and yet ye have utterly forgotten the encouragement which dis-

[1] "A cloud," *i.e.*, a dense multitude, like "a cloud of foot-soldiers," in Hom. *Il.* iv. 274; Herod. viii. 109; and comp. Is. lx. 8. Since patience was the characteristic of the faith of all these elders, he exhorts to patience (ὑπομονή), which Christ also showed (ὑπομείνας τὸν σταυρόν).

[2] As an athletic technicality the word meant "superfluous flesh," such as was reduced by training (Galen, Hippocrates).

[3] εὐπερίστατον occurs here alone in Greek literature. The meanings which have been suggested are, (1) "circumventing," "hemming in on all sides;" (2) "easily avoidable" (comp. περιΐστασο, 2 Tim. ii. 16; Tit. iii. 9); (3) "much-applauded," in the sense of "surrounded by spectators;" (4) "easily-besetting." This last is one of the senses approved by St. Chrysostom and many others (*e.g.*, Erasmus, "*tenaciter inhaerens*;" Bp. Sanderson, "*quae nos arcte complectitur*;" Wiclif, "that standeth about us"), and involves the metaphor of a closely-fitting robe (στατὸς χιτὼν, "a close tunic"), which also seems to be suggested by ἀποθέμενος. (Comp. Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9.)

[4] Ἀρχηγὸν. See Acts iii. 15, "the Prince of life;" v. 31, "a Prince and a Saviour;" *infra*, ii. 10; Is. xxx. 4 (LXX.). Whether, as Riehm and others think, the idea is involved of Jesus also "setting forth and manifesting faith in its perfection" is a very doubtful 'afterthought of theology."

[5] ℵ, D, E have ἑαυτοὺς, "sinners against themselves."

[6] "Unto blood" may either be the technical pugilistic expression ("an athlete can bring no great courage to a contest who has never had blood drawn"—"*qui nunquam suggillatus est*," Sen.); or, more probably, means, "there have as yet been no actual martyrdoms among you." The use of the aorist seems to imply a slight reproach—"ye resisted not *unto*

courseth with you as with sons, My Son, despise not the training of the Lord, nor faint in being corrected by Him: for whom the Lord loveth He traineth, yea, He scourgeth every son whom He accepteth.[1] Endure with a view to your training,[2] since God is dealing with you as with sons" (xii. 1—7).

He continues the illustration of God's Fatherhood by human fatherhood. The father who nobly and wisely loves his child will not spoil him by suffering him to grow up in head-strong wilfulness, but will punish him when punishment is needful, and the father does not thereby lose, but rather increases, his son's reverence for him. How much rather shall we subject ourselves to the Father of our spirits?[3] The punishment of earthly parents is only for the brief

blood, but gave way to the attack." Until we have any grounds for reasonable certainty as to the Church to which this Epistle was addressed, the phrase can hardly be used as an argument in settling the date at which it was written. Certainly in Rome and in Jerusalem there had been martyrdoms before any date which is at all probable for its composition.

[1] Philo comments on the same passage (Prov. iii. 11, 12) in much the same strain (*Opp.* i. 544). The quotation is from the LXX., with slight variations. It agrees with the Hebrew, except that "faint in being corrected" is in the Hebrew "loathe not His correction." The Vat. MS. of the LXX. has ἐλέγχει, "rebukes" or "chastens," for παιδεύει, "trains" (see Rev. iii. 19). In the last clause, for "scourgeth every son, &c.," the Hebrew has "even as a father the son in whom he delighteth." Probably the LXX. read וּכְאֵב for יַכְאִב.

[2] The best reading seems to be εἰς, not εἰ (א, A, D, K, L, etc.).

[3] This is the most natural meaning of τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, especially when we compare it with Num. xvi. 22, "the God of the spirits of all flesh." And this seems to have originated the expression among Rabbinic writers (*v.* Wetstein and Schöttgen, *ad loc.*). Others take it to mean "the Father of spiritual life" (the Author of χαρίσματα, or Divine graces), or "of the spirit-world," *i.e.*, "of angels," &c. But it would not then be a direct antithesis to "fathers of our flesh." To draw any inference here about the verbal controversy (as it seems to me) between *Creationists*—those who consider that the human soul is in each birth distinctly *created*—and *Traducianists*—those who think that it is derived in the way of natural birth—is perfectly futile.

days of their authority, and there mingles with it an element, if not of caprice, yet of the possible errors of human opinion. God corrects us only for our good, that we may partake of His holiness. Now the sterner side of training is never immediately pleasurable; but men enjoy its fruits afterwards in the peace of moral hardihood and serene self-mastery. He urges them then to straighten into vigour the relaxed hands and palsied knees, and to make straight tracks for their feet,[1] that lameness may not be quite put out of joint,[2] but may rather be cured.

"Pursue peace with all,[3] and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord; looking carefully lest there be any one who is falling short of the grace of God—lest any root of bitterness[4] springing up trouble you, and by its means the many be defiled —lest there be any fornicator,[5] or scorner, like Esau, who for one

[1] xii. 13. Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν is an unintentional hexameter. These are metrical accidents. The metaphor is borrowed from Prov. iv. 26. The fact that, besides this hexameter, there are two distinct iambics (ver. 14, 15)—

οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον,
Ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἄπο,

and one half-iambic, ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ (ver. 13), and a bad pentameter (ver. 26)—though the rhythms are evidently unintentional—shows the elaboration and oratorical finish and stateliness of the style.

[2] ἐκτραπῇ. I have given the technical sense of the word (*luxari*); and the familiarity of the writer with St. Luke's language, and, in all probability, with St. Luke himself, makes it not unlikely that he may have learnt a technical term or two from intercourse with "the beloved physician." Possibly, however, the word may have its ordinary sense of "be turned out of the way." 1 Tim. i. 6; v. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 4.

[3] Ps. xxxiv. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 11.

[4] xii. 15; Deut. xxix. 18, "a root that beareth gall and wormwood," or, as in margin, "a poisonful herb." The mention of "gall" has led to the untenable conjecture that we should read ἐν χολῇ here as in the LXX.; but the Alexandrine MS. of the LXX. has ἐνοχλῇ. See Exc. IX.

[5] xii. 16. Since the word here can hardly mean "idolator" (Chrys., Calvin, Grotius, De Wette, Bleek, &c.), and would be too strong to apply to Esau on account of his heathen marriages (Gen. xxvii. 35; xxviii. 8),

meal sold his own birthright.[1] For ye know that afterwards, when he was even anxious to inherit the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no opportunity for repentance—though he sought it [*i.e.*, the blessing] earnestly with tears"[2] (xii. 14—17).

we must suppose that the writer follows the Jewish tradition, as Philo also does, in which Esau was represented as a man of impure life. They applied to him the expression in Prov. xxviii. 21. If it mean apostasy from Jewish privileges (Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm), then *his* πορνεία in abandoning Judaism is compared with the πορνεία of *now* returning to it (Riehm, p. 155, f. 9).

[1] ἑαυτοῦ, א, A, C.

[2] xii. 14—17. The general tenor of the warning is, Do not despise your birthright, lest hereafter you should be unable to recover it when you feel the bitter consequences of the loss. If this clause means that Esau desired to repent, and no chance of repenting was allowed him, it runs counter to the entire tenor of Bible teaching. Hence the τόπος μετανοίας (comp. Wisd. xii. 10) must mean, like its Latin equivalent, "*locus poenitentiae*," not merely an opportunity for repentance, but a chance of so changing his mind as to avert the fatal consequences. "It does not mean," says Theodore of Mopsuestia, "that he did not obtain pardon of sins on repentance, for *that* he was not in any way asking; but that it was never possible for *the blessing* to be given him again." "His tears were tears of remorse for the earthly consequences, not tears of spiritual sorrow (2 Cor. vii. 10). They sprang from the *dolor amissi*, not the *dolor admissi*; from the *dolor ob poenam*, not the *dolor ob peccatum*" (Wordsworth). Hence, though we cannot accept the favourite view of many modern commentators (Beza, Ebrard, Tholuck, &c.) that the words mean "an opportunity of a change of mind *in his father*," we must either (1) give to μετάνοια *some* less special sense than that of "repentance," which it usually bears; or (2) put the clause in a parenthesis, and take it to mean that, as a fact, Esau never repented, which is rendered more probable by the Targum on Job, which says: "All the days of Esau the ungodly they expected that he would have repented, but he repented not;" or (3) we must suppose that it means "he found no opportunity of repentance *of such a kind as would reverse the consequences of his profane levity*, and win him back the blessing." If we take this last view, the "though he sought *it*" may mean "*this kind of* repentance;" if not, we have no alternative but to understand "*it*" of "the blessing." It is perfectly true that there is thus a difficulty either in the construction of the sentence, or in the meaning given to μετάνοια; and some may prefer to say that the passage merely expresses the hopeless condition, *humanly speaking*, of the hardened and defiant apostate, like vi. 4—8; ii. 3; x. 26—31; xii. 25. But if any one rejects all these ways of removing the difficulty, he is left with a statement which will ever furnish its best stronghold to that guilty despair which is antagonistic to all that is best

Then comes the great outburst of triumphant comparison in which he closes this, his main exhortation against the imminent peril of apostasy :—

"For ye have not come to palpable and enkindled fire,[1] and to darkness, and gloom, and storm, and sound of trumpet, and voice of utterances (ῥημάτων), which they who heard deprecated, entreating that no further discourse (λόγον) should be addressed to them, for they could not bear what was being enjoined, 'and if a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned;' and—(so fearful was the pomp of the vision)—Moses said, 'I am terrified and trembling'[2] :—but ye have approached Sion, mountain and city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, to a festal assembly and church of the Firstborn enrolled in Heaven,[3] to a Judge, the God of all, and to the spirits of just men who have been perfected, and to

and most precious in the Gospel of Love. It was the abuse of this passage by the Montanists and Novatians to justify their refusal of absolution to those who fell into sin after baptism which tended to the discrediting of this Epistle in the Western Church.

[1] xii. 18. This rendering may surprise the reader; but ὄρει is omitted by ℵ, A, C, and some of the best versions, and this view is adopted by Bengel, Delitzsch, Tischendorf, Davidson, Moulton, &c. See Ex. xix. 18; xx. 12; Deut. iv. 12. The words may, however, mean "that [mountain] which is material (or 'that is being groped for' (Wordsworth); comp. Ex. x. 21; LXX.) and burned with fire."

[2] In speaking of this terror of Moses at Sinai, the writer follows the Hagadah, unless he can be supposed to refer to Deut. ix. 19. In Shabbath, f 88, *b*, Moses exclaims, "Lord of the Universe, I am afraid lest they (the angels) should consume me with the breath of their mouths." The same tradition of Moses' terror is found in Midrash Koheleth, f. 69. 4, and in Zohar. In Ex. xix. 16 it is said that "all the people trembled." Similarly, in Acts vii. 22 we are told the unrecorded fact that Moses trembled on seeing the burning bush (Ex. iii. 6).

[3] I will not here enter into the voluminous controversy which has arisen as to the punctuation of these words, or the *exact* significance which the writer attached to the expression "church of the first-born enrolled in heaven," because I do not think that any certain conclusions can be arrived at. I take the μυριάσι with ἀγγέλων, because of Deut. xxxiii. 1, 3; Ps. lxviii. 17; Dan. vii. 10; and I suppose the "Church of the first-born enrolled in heaven" to be the Church of Christ, the heir of the spiritual Jacob, while the Jews had forfeited their spiritual birthright. (See Luke x. 30; Rev. iii. 5; xiii. 8; xx. 15; Phil. iv. 3. Comp. Ex. iv. 22; xix. 1—6 with 1 Pet. ii. 9; and see xiii. 8).

Jesus, Mediator of a new covenant,[1] and to a blood of sprinkling which speaketh something better than that of Abel.[2] Take heed that ye do not decline to listen to Him that speaketh. For if *they* escaped not by refusing him who spake on earth, far more shall not we, who are turning away from Him who is from Heaven,[3] Whose voice shook the earth then,[4] but now He hath promised, saying, 'Again, once for all, will I shake not only the earth, but also the Heaven.'[5] Now this 'again once for all' indicates the removal of the things that are being shaken, as of things which have been made, in order that things which cannot be shaken may remain.[6] Wherefore since we are receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us cherish thankfulness, and thereby let us serve God acceptably with holy awe and fear. For, indeed, our God is a consuming fire"[7] (xii. 18—29).

[1] Διαθήκη νέα, as distinguished from the commoner epithet Καινὴ, implies not only that it is "recent," but that it is "young" and "strong."

[2] See ix. 13; x. 22; xi. 4; xiii. 12. "The blood of Abel demanded vengeance, that of Christ remission" (Erasmus). It is curious that, according to Jewish legend, the dispute between Cain and Abel had reference to the question whether God was a judge or not, which, Selden says, was even found in some editions of the Hebrew Pentateuch (*De jur. natal.*). One interpretation of the plural "bloods" in Gen. iv. 10 was that his "blood was sprinkled on the trees and stones" (Surenhus. *Mishna* iv. 229).

[3] Chrysostom, &c., understood Moses to be meant by him that uttereth sacred words on earth. He who speaks from heaven is Jesus. But the contrast evidently is between the voice that spoke on Sinai and that which appeals to us from the heavenly Sion. It is not a contrast between the *speakers*, but between the places from which they spoke, involving as it did the vast difference between the inferior and the superior revelation. The speaker may be regarded as the same, for even the Jews always said that the speaker at Sinai was Michael = the Shechinah = the Angel of the Presence (Isa. lxiii. 9), or of the Covenant (Mal. iii. 1).

[4] See Ex. xix. 18; Judg. v. 4; Ps. cxiv. 7.

[5] Hagg. ii. 6, 7. The words literally mean, "Yet once it is, a little while." Comp. Luke xxi. 26.

[6] The words may also be rendered, "The removing of the things that are being shaken, as of things which have been made in order that the things not shaken may remain."

[7] xii. 18—28. The quotation is from Deut. iv. 24 (comp. ix. 3), and gives a reason why our love of God should be mingled with holy awe and fear. The best reading is μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους, although δέος occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

In this, then, was to be their great encouragement to Faith and Patience. The Dispensation which they were now enjoying was infinitely richer in blessing, infinitely less surrounded with elements of terror, than that under which had lived those Elders of whose steadfast endurance he had just been telling them. In the culminating point of that Dispensation God had spoken to the Israelites of old, not from Heaven, but from the flaming and earthquake-riven peak of the desert mountain. His voice had come with a sound so awful from the dark storm and careering fire as to force from them the entreaty that God would speak to them no more, except through the voice of their lawgiver. Even that great lawgiver had almost recoiled in terror from the awful splendour of the scene. To the mountain itself the Israelites had not dared to approach, for they had been told to set a fence around it, so as not even to touch its border, and if even an animal touched it they were to stone it, or pierce it with a dart. They stood, therefore, afar off, and Jewish legend told how at the utterance of each commandment they recoiled twelve miles, till the ministering angels brought them back.[1] But now the True Israel—they who had accepted the Messiah and King of Israel—had come near, and that with perfect boldness, to another and a heavenly hill, where there were angels indeed in myriads, but not surrounded with attributes of terror; where they would be admitted into the peaceful and blessed communion which united the saints on earth to those in Heaven; and where it was the Voice of the Son of God Himself which invited them to enter the immediate Presence

[1] See McCaul's *Old Paths*, pp. 202—205.

of God, their Loving Judge. If, then, the neglect of that voice from Sinai had brought down its own terrible consequences, how much more inexcusable would it be, how much more terrible, to neglect and despise the Voice which now called to them in tones of infinite tenderness! The earth had trembled at Sinai; the sure word of Prophecy had declared that it should be shaken once again. But there was one thing which could never be shaken, and that was the Kingdom of God into which they had entered. Let that thought be to them one of thankfulness and godly reverence, lest, forfeiting the blessings into which they had been freely admitted, they should find that the Fire of Love was no less terrible to purge and punish than had been that of Sinai to their fathers![1]

The last chapter of the Epistle consists of notices and exhortations, such as the writer considered to be necessary for the Church whose members he is addressing. He urges them to a continuance of their brotherly love.[2] He tells them not to forget hospitality, a virtue which was so indispensable for the happiness of the poor brethren who found themselves in strange towns.[3] It was a virtue for which the ancient Christians were celebrated even among the heathen,[4] and the writer reminds them how by the

[1] Comp. x. 27, 28, 30.

[2] vi. 10; x. 32, 33. Comp. Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 22. Perhaps the neglect, by some, of Christian gatherings had tended to disunion (x. 25).

[3] 1 Pet. iv. 8, 9; Rom. xii. 13; Tit. i. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 2. Comp. Berachoth, f. 63, *b*. and many passages in Hershon's *Treasures of the Talmud*, chap. x.

[4] Lucian, *De mort. Peregr.* 16: "Their principal lawgiver has inspired in them the sentiment that they are all mutually brethren." Julian (*Ep.* 49) says that ἡ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία has been the chief element of success in the spread of their ἀθεότης.

exercise of hospitality some of the elders (like Abraham and Lot and Manoah and Gideon) had even entertained angels unawares.[1] He bids them be mindful of prisoners, as being themselves Christ's prisoners,[2] and of all in distress, liable as they were, while still in the body, to similar sufferings.[3] He bids them in all respects to honour marriage, and to keep undefiled the marriage bed, since God will judge the unclean.[4] He warns them against covetousness,[5] and encourages them to contentment by the blessed promise that God would never leave nor forsake them,[6] a promise which gave

[1] Comp. Matt. xxv. 35. The writer had doubtless read Philo's *De Abrahamo* (*Opp.* ii. 17): "I know not what excess of happiness and blessedness I should ascribe to the household wherein angels deigned to be introduced to men, and to share their gifts of hospitality."

[2] 1 Cor. vii. 22; 2 Cor. ii. 14 ("who leadeth us in triumph"). Lucian, in his curious tract on the Death of Peregrinus, dwells on the extraordinary tenderness of Christians for the Confessors in prison. This incidental notice shows the courage and endurance which a Christian was called on to display in these times of persecution.

[3] Calvin takes *ἐν σώματι* to mean "the body of the *Church*"; but the words standing alone could not bear such a meaning. Here, again, we might be prepared to see a reminiscence of Philo, who says, *ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακούμενοι*, "as being yourselves afflicted in the persons of others" (*De spec. legg.* § 30). But the meaning clearly is, "as being yourselves liable to suffer."

[4] The warnings may have been equally needed by Essenes, who disparaged marriage (1 Tim. iv. 3), and by Antinomians, who made light of unchastity (Acts xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 6; xii, 16).

[5] For a similar juxtaposition of covetousness and uncleanness see 1 Cor. v. 10; vi. 9; Eph. v. 3, 5; Col. iii. 5; and here the very idiom (*ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος· ἀρκούμενοι*) is identical with that of St. Paul (Rom. xii. 9: *ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστυγοῦντες*). It need hardly be added that this is no proof whatever of the Pauline authorship. It is quite clear throughout the Epistle that the writer has lived in close communion with St. Paul, and a writer of such intense originality as St. Paul stamps his thoughts and idioms on the minds of his associates. These similarities only force into more prominent relief the marked individuality of the style of the present writer.

[6] "He hath said." "He," as in the Talmud, means God (הוא אמר). The exact words, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee," do not occur

them an impregnable security against all assaults of man. He bids them bear in memory their leaders who had passed away[1]—leaders who once spoke to them the Word of God, "whose faith imitate, contemplating the issue of their Christian walk."[2]

And since those leaders had ever preached Christ, Who *is* the Word of God—(though here again the term is not *directly* applied to Him)—he warns them once more of their tendency to be seduced by the haughty boasts and privileges of Judaism, or by any which would lead them to relapse into the religion from which they had been converted.

"Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.[3] Be not swept away[4] by various and strange teachings. For it is a beautiful thing[5] to be established in heart by grace,[6] not by meats, in which they who walked were not benefited.[7] We have an altar,[8]

in the Old Testament, though they are so quoted by Philo (*De confus. ling.* § 32). The expression may be taken from 1 Chr. xxviii. 20; Deut. xxxi. 6, 8; or (more probably) Josh. i. 5.

[1] *If* the letter was addressed to Palestine, these leaders would include such men as St. Stephen and St. James the brother of St. John.

[2] The word ἔκβασιν ("outcome") occurs only in 1 Cor. x. 13, where it is rendered "escape." The word here may imply their death (on the analogy of ἔξοδος, 2 Pet. i. 15; Lk. ix. 31. and ἄφιξις, "departure," Acts xx. 29). It means that they were faithful to the end (see Wisd. ii. 17).

[3] Mal. iii. 6; Ja. i. 17.

[4] "Being swept away (περιφερόμενοι) by every wind of teaching" (Eph. iv. 14).

[5] Ver. 9, καλὸν.

[6] Its meaning is that our security should rest on God's grace, not on Levitical rules and distinctions about meats and drinks, which had been profitless to the Jews, who attached so much importance to them. On the extent to which these questions agitated the ancient Church, and their bearing on daily life, see *Life of St. Paul*, i. 254; and comp. ix. 10; Rom. xiv.; Col. ii. 16—23; 1 Tim. iv. 3; and Gal. vi. 12, 13. No doubt the Jews appealed to the eternal Pharisaism of the human heart, and said to the Christian converts, "We live Jewish-wise; you have degraded yourself into living Gentile fashion (ἐθνικῶς, Gal. ii. 14); you neglect the Kashar; you feed with those who are defiled by eating of the unclean beast."

[7] x. 29; xii. 15, 28.

[8] Namely, "the Cross." See *infra*.

wherefrom they have no license to eat who serve the tabernacle.[1] For the bodies of those animals, the blood of which is carried by the High Priest into the holy place, are burned outside the camp. Therefore Jesus also, that he may sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate.[2] Let us then go forth to him outside the camp, bearing his reproach.[3] For we have not here an abiding city, but we are seeking further for that which is to come. Through him, then, let us offer up a sacrifice of praise[4] continually

[1] The connexion is not quite obvious at first sight, but seems to be as follows:—He has said that "matters of meat" had been found unprofitable (vii. 18, 19), and is perhaps reminded of the boasted Jewish privilege of partaking of the sacrifices (1 Cor. ix. 13), which was of course no longer possible for Christians whom the Jews had excommunicated. So far, then, the Christians may have felt, and may have been taunted with, their loss. But the writer reminds them that *their* sacrifice was analogous to the highest and most solemn of all the Jewish sacrifices—those offered on the Day of Atonement. Now of these neither the priests nor any of the Jews might eat (Lev. iv. 12; vi. 30; xvi. 27). The bodies of these victims were burnt without the camp, just as our Divine Victim suffered outside the city gate. Now of *our* altar, of *our* sacrifices, *we* may eat (John vi. 51—56). We are bidden spiritually to eat His flesh, and drink His blood. But of *this* altar, of *this* sacrifice, they who serve the Tabernacle (see viii. 5) may not eat. We, therefore, are better off than they. Let us then go forth to Him out of the old city which rejected Him and the old dispensation—which refused to recognise its own annulment; let us bear His reproach, that we may also enjoy the blessings which He offers.

[2] His suffering without the gate (Matt. xxvii. 32) corresponded to the sacrifice of the victim, and the burning of its body; the sanctification of His people by the blood of this sacrifice, with which He has passed into the heavens, corresponds to the sprinkling of the blood by the high priest in the holiest place.

[3] Matt. v. 10—12; Lk. vi. 22. The Jews treated them as outcasts and apostates, but they were to remember that they were citizens not of the doomed city (Matt. xxiv. 2), but of the city that hath the foundations which were not material but built by God. Possibly in this "reproach" there may be a passing allusion to the fact that those who burnt the bodies of the Atonement-victims outside the camp, were ceremonially unclean; but far more to the fixed Jewish conception that he who was crucified was "accursed of God" (Deut. xxi. 22, 23). (See *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 77, 148.)

[4] See Lev. vii. 12; Pss. xliv. 23; cxvi. 17. The Jews had a very remarkable saying that in the days of the Messiah all other sacrifices should cease, but that the sacrifices of praise (Jer. xvii. 26) should never cease.

to God, that is the fruit of lips which confess to His name.[1] But forget not beneficence, and free-sharing of your goods, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased"[2] (xiii. 8—16).

This passage, like multitudes of others in the Holy Scriptures, has been pressed into modern controversies with which it has no connexion. The whole context shows that the word "altar" is here secondary, incidental, and metaphorical. The passage is highly compressed, and is so allusive that we should hardly be able to understand it apart from the tenor of the argument which has occupied the main part of the Epistle. I have endeavoured in the note to explain its meaning. Here I may, perhaps, add a general paraphrase. Do not forget the rulers of your Church who have ended consistent lives by holy deaths. Imitate their faith. They are gone, but the object of their faith is deathless and unchangeable: Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Be then steadfast in the immutable truth of His doctrine. Do not be swept away by gusts of everchanging opinion—particularly those of the Jewish Halachists, who spend their whole lives in torturing strange inferences out of Levitic regulations. The meats and drinks with which this science of the Halachah is mainly occupied have been proved by the experience of ages to be in themselves profitless (vii. 18, 19). It is not scrupulosity about ceremonial minutiae, but it is the grace of God

[1] Is. lvii. 19, "I create the fruit of the lips." Hos. xiv. 2; (lit., our lips, as calves); but as the next verse says, we must (unlike the Jews of old, Is. xxix. 13—21; Ezek. xxxiii. 21) offer to God the sacrifices of well-doing, as well as of praise, and thank Him with our lives as well as with our lips (Matt. xv. 1—9).

[2] xiii. 8—16. On this beneficence and participation of earthly goods see Rom. xii. 13; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 18.

which is the real stay and security of the spiritual and moral life. When they speak about these distinctions of clean and unclean meats—doubtless your priestly antagonists taunt you with their privilege of partaking of many sacrifices, such as the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, and wave-offerings, and doves—a privilege of which you, priests though you are to God (1 Pet. ii. 5; Rev. i. 6; xx. 6), may share no longer. Be it so. Still our case is far superior to theirs. For of their greatest and most significant sacrifices, those offered on the Day of Atonement, even their High Priests could not partake. The blood of those victims was sprinkled on the mercy seat, their bodies were burnt without the camp. Since, then, the Jewish Priests were forbidden to eat of the type, how could they have license to eat of the antitype? But we, too, have our great sacrifice, and we *may* eat of it, and it is "food indeed." It is the sacrifice of Him Who was offered without the gate, whose blood is sprinkled to sanctify His people, and to sanctify even the heavenly places (ix. 12—28); and on that sacrifice we may live by perpetual sustenance. He was rejected; He was thrust outside the city to be offered up. Let us go forth to Him, bearing His reproach. If we leave the city of our affection, we are at the best but strangers and sojourners there, and we are going forth to the Heavenly and the Eternal City. That earthly city will be shaken; the Heavenly City is one of those things which can never be shaken, and will remain. Let us then offer our thankofferings to Him. Those thankofferings are not the bullocks enjoined by the Levitic law (Lev. vii. 12); they are "the bullocks of our lips," and those thankofferings will be acceptable if we offer therewith the thankofferings of holy lives.

It will be seen, then, that what is prominent is the sacrifice, and our sustenance thereby. No prominence is given to the altar on which the sacrifice is offered. It is, so to speak, *extra figuram*. If in the mind of the writer any significance was attached to the "altar," it could only be explained as THE CROSS, as it is understood by St. Thomas Aquinas and the Roman Catholic Este, no less than by De Wette and Bleek. It was on the altar of burnt-offering that the Jewish victims were slain; it was on the Cross that our great High Priest perfected once and for ever the offering of Himself. The Cross, then, is the altar, not the *material* Table of the Lord. What the writer had in mind was the feeding on Christ in the heart by faith; living not on His flesh, which, materially considered, profiteth nothing, but on His words, which are spirit and life, and of which they who rejected Him neither might nor could eat. The "eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking His blood" was the symbol—far commoner, far less strange, far more directly intelligible to any one familiar with Jewish habits of thought and expression than it is to ourselves—of that close union with Him whereby "He that sanctifieth and they that are being sanctified are all of one," and whereby it is not we who live, but Christ in us. The Victim Lamb has been once offered (ix. 25—28), but after a heavenly and spiritual manner we may feed upon Him, and so be partakers of the Altar until we see Him face to face.[1]

[1] Whether it is desirable or not to speak of the Lord's Table as an altar is a question of very secondary interest. Certainly there would not be the smallest objection to doing so if the meaning of the term was never perverted in support of false and superstitious conclusions. But even Baxter said that it is no more improper to call the Lord's Supper a

Then follows an exhortation to obey and be subject to their leaders,[1] who watched sleeplessly for their souls as men who would have to give an account, so that they might give their account with joy, and not with groaning, which would be "unprofitable" for them—a euphemistic way of saying that it would be for their deep disadvantage. Then he asks them for their prayers, adding a profession of conscientious sincerity, such as St. Paul also had to make on more than one occasion.[2] And he begs for these prayers in the hope that they might bring about a speedier restoration of the writer to their society.[3]

"But the God of Peace[4] who brought up from the dead[5] that Great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus,[6] by virtue of the blood of an eternal covenant,[7] stablish you in every good work so that ye may do His will, doing that in you,[8] through Jesus Christ,

sacrifice (as was constantly done in the ancient Church), than it is "to call our bodies, and our alms, and our prayers sacrifices." "And the naming of the Table an altar, as related to *this* representative sacrifice, is no more improper than the other." (*Christian Institutes*, i. 304, quoted by Wordsworth. Baxter applies this passage *directly* to sacramental communion.)

[1] The emphasis laid on this injunction perhaps hints at tendencies to self-assertion and insubordination. In the importance given to the position of these leaders we see the gradual growth of episcopal powers.

[2] Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. i. 13, *πειθόμεθα*, ℵ? A, C, D; Acts xxvi. 26, *πεποίθαμεν*; Gal. v. 10; Phil. i. 25; ii. 24. It is probable that some would look with suspicion, and even with angry denunciation, at the spiritual freedom in all matters of form which was claimed and exercised by the school of St. Paul. These concluding sentences of the Epistle greatly resemble those of St. Paul, and were probably a common feature in letters of his friends. See Col. iv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 25.

[3] Phil. 22. The circumstances that hindered him may have been of a special character ("but Satan hindered us," 1 Thess. ii. 18); we cannot at all conjecture what they were.

[4] xiii. 14; Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23, etc.

[5] The only allusion to Christ's Resurrection in this Epistle (comp. vi. 2; xi. 35; Rom. x. 7).

[6] Zech. ix. 11; Is. lxiii. 11.

[7] ix. 15—18; Ex. xxiv. 8.

[8] *εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι . . ποιῶν . . ἐν ὑμῖν* (comp. Phil. ii. 13, *ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ το θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν*).

which is well-pleasing before Him, to whom be the glory which is His for ever.[1] Amen.

"But I beseech you, brethren, bear with the word of my exhortation.[2] For indeed I have written to you briefly.[3] Ye know[4] that our brother Timothy has been set free, with whom, if he come soon, I will see you. Salute all your leaders and all the saints. The Italians salute you. Grace be with you all. Amen."

The last clauses have been pressed into the discussion of the authorship of the Epistle, but they are too vague to give any real clue. All that we learn from the allusion to Timothy is that he had been detained, probably in prison, but that now he had been liberated, and that it was the intention of the writer to visit in his company the Church to which he was writing, if Timothy came sufficiently soon. There is not the slightest clue as to where Timothy or the writer were at the time when the letter was written. Even the inferred imprisonment of Timothy is uncertain, for the word used of him (*ἀπολελυμένον*), though used of liberation from prison (Acts iii. 13, iv. 21), is also used of official, and even of ordinary, dismissal on any errand or mission (Acts xix. 41, xxiii. 22).[5] It is, however, as I have already said, a reasonable conjec-

[1] Gal. i. 5.

[2] Acts xiii. 15. A courteous apology, lest he should seem to have adopted a tone of authority which he did not possess.

[3] Acts xv. 20; xxi. 25; *διὰ βραχέων*=*δι' ὀλίγων*; 1 Pet. v. 12: "paucis pro copiâ rerum et argumenti dignitate" (Bengel). Ἐπέστειλα is the epistolary aorist, which may be idiomatically represented in English either by "I write" "or "I have written," He adds "briefly" to show that he had had no space for lengthened apologies, or for anything but a direct and compressed argument and appeal. Possibly, however, this allusion to the brevity of his letter is given as a reason why they should bear with it. "Since you see that I have not troubled you at any great length."

[4] Or "know." It cannot mean "Pay friendly regard to."

[5] Even Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Œcumenius felt no *certainty* that *ἀπολελυμένον* meant "freed from prison."

ture that Timothy obeyed with all speed the urgent summons of St. Paul in his second letter, and either arrived in time to be present at the martyrdom of the Apostle or soon afterwards. The Church in Rome was then suffering from the Neronian persecution, and any one who came to Rome as a prominent Christian, and as a devoted friend of the greatest Christian teacher, would have been little likely to escape suspicion and arrest. If so, we are unable even to conjecture the circumstances to which he owed his acquittal. Perhaps his comparative youth, and the unobtrusive timidity of his character may have worked in his favour. But if these conjectures are true, he must have been set free at Rome, and this would be a proof that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written to some other place. The data are, however, too slight to furnish any ground on which to build; and when Ewald ventures, from these hints, to conjecture that the letter may have been addressed to a Christian community at Ravenna, he might have conjectured a hundred other places with just as much, and just as little, probability.

Nor can anything be deduced from the salutation which the writer sends. His words literally translated are, "Those from Italy salute you."[1] If we give to these words the sense which they ordinarily bear, they must mean "the Italians," just as "The scribes from Jerusalem" mean "Jerusalemite scribes" (Matt. xv. 1), and "those from Cilicia" means "Cilicians" (Acts vi. 9), and "the Jews from Thessalonica" mean "Thessalonian Jews" (Acts xvii. 13), and "the Jews from Asia" means "Asiatic Jews" (Acts xxi. 27). But there is

[1] See *supra*, p. 344.

nothing to show where these Italians were residing, or what interest would be felt in their salutation by the purely conjectural Church to which the letter is addressed.

The subscription to the Epistle in the Alexandrine manuscript is, "It was written to the Hebrews from Rome." That in the Moscow Manuscript (K) and in the Syriac and Coptic Versions is, "It was written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timotheus," and this is adopted in our received text. Both subscriptions are destitute of authority, and the latter is in plain contradiction with what we should infer from the allusion to Timothy in the letter itself. It would be interesting to us to know more of the history of the letter, but this is no longer discoverable. Like Melchizedek, it has been said, the letter is ἀπάτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, without known father or lineage. None the less it will always remain as a priceless possession to the Church. Its eloquence, its enthusiasm, its loftiness of conception, would alone suffice to stamp it as a remarkable work; but its highest value lies in the force and originality of its whole train of reasoning. No Epistle even of St. Paul was so well calculated to win the unconverted Hebrews, or when they had embraced Christianity, to save them from their temptation to succumb under the force of grievous persecution, and to find refuge once more from the reproach of Christ in the Synagogue of their fathers. For no writer had ever yet developed with such grace and power the thought that the New Dispensation was not the ruinous overthrow, but the glorious fulfilment of the Old; that the Christian, so far from being robbed of that viaticum of good examples which had been the glory of Judaism, could feed upon

them with a deeper sympathy; that the Temple and the whole Levitic ritual, so far from being scornfully flung aside by the follower of Jesus, did but shine with a new splendour in the light of that revelation which, for the first time, shed on them a blaze of more glorious significance. To retrograde into Judaism after the study of this Epistle would indeed be to go back into the darkness from the noonday. But yet this conclusion was brought home both to the Jew and to the Jewish Christian so gently, so considerately, so skilfully, so gradually, that the reader was drawn along as by a golden chain of irresistible reasoning, without one violent wrench of his prejudices, or one rude shock to his lifelong convictions. The golden candlestick of the Church to which these words were addressed must, indeed, have been burning dim if the tendency of any of its members to flag or to apostatise—to prefer Moses to Christ, and the Temple to the true Church of the firstborn—was not checked for ever by arguments which enabled them to see their true position in the light of such inspired and inspiring wisdom.

Book IV.

JUDAIC CHRISTIANITY.

Book IV.

JUDAIC CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER XIX.

"THE LORD'S BROTHER."

"No man having drunk old wine desireth new, for he saith, 'The old is excellent.'"—LUKE v. 39.

WE now pass to yet another phase of Christianity—neither Pauline nor Alexandrian, but distinctively Jewish. Of this phase—the type of Christianity which prevailed with unbroken continuity in the Holy City until its destruction, and was afterwards maintained among the Nazarenes—we have a magnificent specimen in the Epistle of St. James.

But before we can understand this Epistle, or enter with intelligent sympathy into the truths which it was its mission to proclaim, it will be essential for us to discover by whom it was written.

Now, all the clue which the author gives us as to his identity is by calling himself "James, a slave of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ."

But, unfortunately, the same name and the same description is equally applicable to others. The name thus Anglicised is, in reality, that of the old Hebrew

patriarch Jacob,[1] the father of the twelve Patriarchs who gave their names to the Tribes of Israel. That "Syrian ready to perish"[2]—the wretched supplanter who ultimately reached the moral grandeur of a Prince with God—was what the Greeks would have called the Hero Eponumos of the Jewish nation. Hence the name Yakoob was as common in Palestine in our Lord's day as it is to this day in many parts of the East. There was among the Jews a remarkable paucity of personal names, and the fact that persons, and even groups of persons, had the same names, is but of little importance in defining their identity, particularly when they belong to kindred families. The name of James gives us as little clue to a man's identity as would the name William in England, or Mohammed in Egypt.

Now, in the little Galilean group of early disciples we find no less than six persons so called. These are—

1. James, the son of Zebedee, brother of John (Matt. iv. 21; Mark i. 19; Luke v. 10).

2. James, the son of Alphæus (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18).

3. James, mentioned with Joses (*i.e.*, Joseph), Simon, and Judas as one of the "brothers" of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 55, xxvii. 56; Mark vi. 3).

4. James "the little," brother of a Joseph, and son of a Mary (Mark xv. 40) who, as we find from John xix. 25, was the wife of Clopas.

5. James, the "Bishop" of Jerusalem, "the Lord's

[1] In Hebrew, Yakoob; in Greek, Ἰάκωβος; Spanish, Iago; Portuguese, Xayme; French, Jacques and Jamè; Scotch, Hamish. See the Introduction to my friend Dr. Plumptre's excellent edition of the Epistle in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

[2] "A Syrian ready to perish was my father" (Deut. xxvi. 5).

brother" (Gal. i. 19), who plays a leading part in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts xv. 13, xxi. 8), and held a position of high authority in the early Church (1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9).

6. James, the brother of Jude (Jude i. 1).

There cannot be the least reasonable doubt that these six, who are referred to under this name, are in reality three.

For James, the son of Alphæus (No. 2), is rightly identified with the son of Mary (No. 4), who from his diminutive stature is called "the little."[1] This is intrinsically probable, and is confirmed by the fact that Clopas is only the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew Chalpai, which, in the universal Jewish fashion, was further Grecised, for use among the Gentiles, into the classical name Alphæus.

And James, "the Lord's brother" (No. 3) is, beyond doubt, the first "Bishop" of Jerusalem (No. 5) and the brother of Jude (No. 6).

And both of these were probably first cousins to each other, and to the third James, the son of Zebedee. The question then arises (1) Which of these three is the author of the Epistle? And this question is inextricably mixed up with the further question (2) Is the son of Alphæus the same as the first "Bishop" of Jerusalem? And this question really depends for its solution on, the question, Who were our Lord's brethren? or, in other words, are we, by the term "brethren" to understand His cousins? But we have then further to ask, If the Apostle, the son of Alphæus, is *not* the same as the "Bishop" of Jerusalem, the

[1] This is the meaning of the word μικρὸς in Luke xix. 3 (Zacchæus, "little of stature").

Lord's brother, which of the two wrote this Epistle —the Apostle or the Bishop?

It might have been thought that the question of authorship was set at rest so far as the son of Zebedee is concerned. For—

a. Not a single ancient author ever thought of attributing the Epistle to him.

β. He was the first martyr of the Twelve Apostles, and since his martyrdom took place in the reign of Herod Agrippa I., A.D. 44, fourteen years after the Ascension,[1] the Epistle, if written by him, would be the earliest work of the entire canon. The allusions of the Epistle, and the state of circumstances which it describes as existing in the Church, are incompatible with this supposition. Setting aside for the present the question whether it was meant to be a polemical answer to those who misinterpreted or exaggerated the views of St. Paul, it is clear on other grounds that it could not have been written so early as A.D. 44. For it is addressed to the twelve tribes of the Dispersion, and until the missionary labours of St. Paul, Christianity had not spread to the Jews throughout the world. Even those of Asia Minor, as well as those of Greece, heard the name of the Lord Jesus for the first time from his lips. The doctrine of "justification by faith," in that distinctive form which alone rendered it liable to perversion,[2] had never been previously preached by any Christian teacher. It found its great exponent in the Apostle of the Gentiles, and its elaborate development in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. And, not to dwell on other points, the whole tone of the letter shows that it

[1] Acts xii. 2.

[2] 2 Pet. iii. 15.

is addressed to Churches which were liable to fall into a slumbering Christianity, and not to Churches which were feeling the glow of their first love. Respect of persons, for instance, had already grown up in these Jewish-Christian communities. These reasons have been so strongly and universally felt that not one of the Fathers has imagined that this letter was written by the son of Zebedee, the first Apostolic martyr. The only authority, if the name "authority" can be given to such a careless mistake, is to be found in a single Latin manuscript of the ninth century. The MSS. of the Peshito version do, indeed, attribute it to "James the Apostle;" but it is idle to interpret this to mean James, the son of Zebedee, when it is far more probable that the term was meant to describe James, the son of Alphæus; or (if not) that the term Apostle—in accordance with the *less* specific use of it in the Apostolic age[1]—is meant to describe the general dignity of James, the Lord's brother.

It is therefore to be regretted that so baseless a theory should have been supported by an English commentator in one of the latest editions of this Epistle.[2] The arguments which he adduces are entirely inconclusive. The supposed improbability that one of the inner circle of Apostles should have passed away without any written memorial of his teaching would be worth nothing as an argument even if the death of the son of Zebedee had not occurred at so early an epoch. The supposed resemblances to the teaching of John the Baptist are of the most general character; they might occur equally well in

[1] Andronicus, Junias (Rom. xvi. 7).
[2] By the Rev. F. T. Bassett (Bagsters, 1876).

any Christian writer,[1] and might be illustrated by many other parallels. Moreover, it is more than doubtful whether James, the son of Zebedee, had ever been a disciple of the Baptist. It is implied that he was not with the little group of disciples who were with the Baptist at Jordan when they first heard the call of Christ. The resemblances of the Epistle to the Sermon on the Mount, would be accounted for equally well if the writer were the son of Alphæus. They do not require the theory that the writer heard the sermon, since they might have been derived from intercourse with St. Matthew, or from a perusal of the outlines which perhaps formed the original nucleus of the Gospels.[2] But even if they did involve the certainty that the author of the Epistle had personally heard Christ's gracious words, there is not the least unlikelihood that James, the Lord's brother, may have been seated as well as the son of Zebedee amid that listening throng. The notion that the phrase "The Lord of Glory" renders it probable that the writer had seen the Transfiguration is an argument so fragile and so far-fetched[3] that it could only be dictated by despair of more valid indications. Vain-glory, rivalry, and self-seeking may have existed in the Apostolic band, and the son of Zebedee may himself have shared in these frailties, as he did in a vehement

[1] Jas. i. 22, 27; ii. 15, 16, 19, 20; v. 1—6 (comp. Matt. iii. 8—12; Luke iii. 11).

[2] It seems to be doubtful whether the word *logia* in the well-known passage of Papias means "discourses;" but in any case discourses of our Lord must have been early committed to writing by some of the disciples.

[3] It was a common and well-known Jewish designation with reference to the Shechinah. Compare "cherubim of glory," Heb. i. 3; ix. 5; Acts vii. 2; Eph. i. 17, *supra*, p. 416.

intolerance which savoured rather of the Elijah-spirit than the spirit of Christ;[1] but it is surely strange to adduce the warnings against these faults, and the reference to Elias, as conferring any probability on a theory which otherwise has nothing in its favour. The inferences drawn from the parallelism of some passages to the First Epistle of St. Peter,[2] and to the great eschatological discourse of our Lord, are as much overstrained as the others. They do not confer on this hypothesis any claim to serious attention, and it may be regarded as finally dismissed.

2. There is more to be said for the claim of the Son of Alphæus.[3] That is supported by the ancient theory that the son of Alphæus was, in fact, the same person as the Bishop of Jerusalem.[4] Beyond this theory, however, it has nothing in its favour. For this "James the little," or "James, the son of Alphæus," is to us a name and nothing more. Not one incident is narrated of him; not one utterance is attributed to him in the Gospels; not one fact is preserved respecting him by any tradition older than those recorded, or accepted, or invented, by Nicephorus in the fourteenth century.[5] It is inexcusable to argue *à priori* as Lange does that the son of Alphæus *must* be

[1] Luke ix. 54. [2] See *supra*, p. 129.

[3] To argue that "James the Lord's brother" *must* have been one of the Apostles, from Gal. i. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 7, is to ignore the commonest facts of the Greek language. Even *if* in these passages he were identified with, not excluded from, the number of the Apostles, they would prove nothing; for James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, was an Apostle just as much as Barnabas or Paul.

[4] In the Apostolical Constitution (ii. 55) James the son of Alphæus is especially distinguished from the Lord's brother.

[5] Nicephorus (*H. E.* ii. 40) says that he preached in South-West Palestine, and was ultimately crucified at Ostracine, in Lower Egypt. See Cave, *Lives of the Apostles*, and *supra*, p. 86.

James, "the Lord's brother," and Bishop of Jerusalem, because "the assumption is highly improbable that James, the son of Alphæus, should, in so short a time, have vanished from the stage past all tracing, without being thought worthy of having even his death noticed by Luke, the historian, and that there should suddenly have sprung up some non-apostolical James, who actually occupied a prominent position among the Apostles." The instance of Philip might be alone sufficient to show the futility of the argument; for Philip the deacon springs into extreme prominence in the Acts of the Apostles without any further mention of Philip the Apostle. When Lange says, further, that it is "purely inconceivable" that James, "a recently-converted non-Apostle," should have been acknowledged so early as a man of Apostolical authority, it is strange that he should regard as "purely inconceivable" what was an actual fact in the cases of Barnabas and Paul. When he adds, "If anything, it is still more inconceivable that the names of three real Apostles (James, Simon, Jude) should have been extinguished without all trace by the names of three non-Apostles," he is making capital out of an identity of names which is not of the smallest significance. For that the prominence of every one of the twelve, except Peter and John, was from the first obliterated, so far as our Scriptural record is concerned, by the names of others who were not among the original twelve, is proved by the New Testament itself, and by every trace of early Church history. And as for the names James, Simon, Jude, it is as certain that no one could have taken a walk through the streets of Jerusalem without meeting dozens, per-

haps scores, of people who bore one or other of those names, as it is that you would meet scores of people who bore the names of John, George, or Thomas in a walk through London streets. The fact is, that of the Twelve Apostles the majority are only known to us as names, sometimes undistinguished by a single incident. We know less of the son of Alphæus than of any one among their number. We are told the name of his father and of his mother, and nothing more.

His father was Alphæus, who, as we have seen, was the same as Clopas (John xix. 25; Matt. x. 3).[1] It is usually asserted that he cannot be the Cleopas to whom our Lord appeared on the road to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 18), because that name is an abbreviated form of Cleopater, whereas Cleopas, or Chalpai, is a Hebrew name, of which Alphæus is the current assonance adopted for intercourse with the Gentile world. But it is as little improbable that this disciple may have had both names, as that Judas should have been called both Lebbæus and Thaddæus. However this may be, we know nothing more of Alphæus except that the name of his wife was Mary, and that his other sons were Matthew and Thomas. "Jude of James" would be yet another son, if we could be sure that it meant "brother of James." In the absence, however, of any evidence to the contrary, it is more natural to take it to mean "*son* of James."

But was the Mary, who was the wife of Alphæus, a sister of the Virgin Mary?[2] This has been inferred

[1] The E. V. has Cleophas, which only comes from late Latin MSS.

[2] In the paucity of Jewish names, and the commonness of the name Mary, there is no decisive objection to this view from the fact that, in this

from John xix. 25, where the punctuation which some would adopt is, "there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene." But, apart from the authority of the Peshito, which inserts "and" before Mary, it is now generally accepted that by this verse *four* women are intended, namely—(1) The Virgin Mary; (2) her sister Salome, who being St. John's mother, is left unnamed by his delicate reserve; and the two other Maries, namely—(3) the wife of Clopas, and (4) Mary of Magdala.

Is it, then, the case that Alphæus, or Clopas, was the brother of St. Joseph, and therefore (legally) the uncle of our Lord? The suggestion is supported by the testimony of Hegesippus.[1] It may be true or not; but that the sons of Alphæus were our Lord's "brothers" is only a conjecture of Jerome, made in the interests of an ecclesiastical hypothesis. His authority gave it currency, and consequently a rash conjecture, treated even by its author as unimportant, became the favourite theory of the Western Church.[2]

A still later afterthought—planted upon this groundless conjecture, like a rootless stalk on a thin soil—is the guess that Alphæus died early, and left all his sons to be supported by his brother Joseph; that they

case, two sisters would have borne the same name. No doubt such instances are rare, but I have found several in ancient and modern history.

[1] *Ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22.

[2] Thus in the Church of England July 25th is dedicated to the Son of Zebedee, and May 1st to St. Philip and St. James; and since part of the Epistle of St. James is read on that day, it is clear that "the son of Alphæus" is identified with "the brother of the Lord." In the Greek Church they are distinguished—October 9th is dedicated to the son of Alphæus, and October 23rd to the brother of the Lord.

thus became legally Joseph's sons, and can thus be called "the brethren of the Lord."

These are hypotheses invented to support a conception of which no trace is discoverable in Scripture, and which is mixed up with many aberrations of Essenian and Gnostic asceticism. All that we know about James the Apostle is that he was a son of Alphæus, and that he was called "the little." All that we can reasonably conjecture is that he was "a cousin of the Lord."

3. It may be regarded as certain, in accordance with ancient tradition,[1] and with the best of modern opinions, that the author of the Epistle is the "Bishop of Jerusalem," and the "brother of the Lord."

But is he *identical with* the son of Alphæus? There seems to have been a confused notion among some ancient writers that he was, and this view is accepted by many modern commentators, among whom I may mention Lange and Bishop Wordsworth.

The identification is, however, only possible to those who hold, in despite of the plain evidence of the Synoptists, and still more of St. John, that our Lord's "brethren" were among the number of His Apostles. For if James, the Lord's brother, was indeed the same person as the son of Alphæus, then Jude also, and, according to some, Simon too, and Matthew, and perhaps Thomas, were "brethren of the Lord," since they, too, were sons of Alphæus. So that we shall have this singular phenomenon—that whereas four only of our Lord's "brethren" are mentioned by name, viz., James and Joseph and Judas and Simon, *three* out of these four were Apostles, and certainly one, if not two

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23; Jer. *De Virr. Illustr.* 2.

other sons of Alphæus were also Apostles; and yet we are expressly told that "*neither did His brethren believe in Him.*"[1] An attempt is made to get rid of this plain contradiction by saying that His brethren had not "the resigned obedience of faith," so that in the same sense it might have been said that neither Peter, nor Thomas, nor even the Blessed Virgin, believed on Him![2] And this theory is (ostensibly) to be built on the notion that it is "inconceivable" that a James, a Simon, and a Jude should have been Apostles, and yet that there should have been another James, another Simon,[3] and another Jude who became distinguished in the Church. There is, however, nothing inconceivable, nothing about it even improbable. There were hundreds, and even thousands, who, at this epoch, bore those names. Even among the twelve Apostles there were two Simons, two Jameses, and two Judes; among the handful of those first connected with Christianity there were nine Simons, three Jameses, six Josephs, and four Judes; and in the very narrow circle of early disciples there were five Maries.[4] Any one, therefore, who considers this identity of names to be "purely inconceivable," must be extremely limited alike in his power of imagination[5] and in his knowledge of facts.

I hold it, then, as certain that James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, and "the Lord's brother," was *not* the same

[1] John vii. 5.

[2] Lange, *Introd.* § ii. 1. and in Herzog's Cyclopædia, *s. v.* Jacobus.

[3] Tradition, as preserved by Hegesippus (*ap.* Euseb. iv. 23), says that Simon, son of Clopas, succeeded James as Bishop of Jerusalem because he was our Lord's cousin (ἀνέψιος).

[4] (1) The Virgin; (2) the wife of Clopas; (3) Mary Magdalene; (4) Mary of Bethany; (5) Mary, mother of John Mark.

[5] Hegesippus says, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι ἐκαλοῦντο.

person as the Apostle, the son of Alphæus.[1] The latter was one of the Twelve; the former was one of those who up to a late period in the life of Christ "did not believe on Him."

But having advanced thus far, it is almost impossible to avoid saying one word more on the question of the Lord's brethren—(1) Were they, as Helvidius thought, the sons of Joseph and Mary? or (2) were they, as Jerome fancied, the adopted nephews of Joseph? or (3) were they, as Epiphanius argued, sons of Joseph by a previous or, (4) as Theophylact suggests, by a Levirate marriage?

Now, on this question I have no desire either to dogmatise or to press my own opinion; but I will endeavour once more, in the fewest and simplest words, to indicate the inference to which the Gospels seem to point. And in doing so I shall dwell on two considerations, which, in spite of the enormous mass of literature upon the subject, have been all but universally neglected.

The inference, whether correct or not, to which the language of the Evangelists would naturally lead us, certainly is that "the Lord's brothers" were the children of Joseph and Mary, born in holy wedlock after the birth of Christ. Can any one honestly say that such is not, at least, the *primâ facie* conclusion which every reader would draw from the Gospel allusions and the Gospel narrative?

In the very first chapter of the Gospel we are told that "Joseph took unto him his wife, and knew her not until she brought forth her son, her firstborn, and

[1] This denial of their identity has the powerful support of Gregory of Nyssa, *De Resurr. Orat.* ii.; Chrysost. *in Matt. Hom.* 5; and Jerome [who, however, wavers] *in Isai.* xvii., and *in Gal.* i. 19.

called his name Jesus." Now would not the aorist "took unto him" (παρέλαβε) in connexion with the imperfect tense "knew her not" (ἐγίνωσκεν), to say nothing of the words "her son, her firstborn,"[1] naturally lead us, in any ordinary case, to conclude that Joseph and Mary lived together in wedded union after the birth of Jesus, and that children were born to them?

Of course the verse is not in itself decisive. Instances may be adduced in which an action is said *not* to have happened *until* a certain time, and yet is not thereby asserted to have happened after the lapse of the fixed period. Other instances may be quoted in which the word "firstborn" does not *necessitate* a belief in the birth of subsequent children. Proofs to this effect were adduced by Bishop Pearson, and have been repeated by hundreds since. But this much may be affirmed—that if it had been a heresy to deny the Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin—(as St. Augustine and others have tried to hint, in accordance with the fatal tendency of theologians to brand as heretical everything that does not coincide with their own inferences)—then the Evangelists would not have gone out of their way to use an exceptional idiom, which seemed to countenance such a heresy. They would, on the contrary, have been anxious to avoid language which could not but lead ordinary readers to understand them in the very sense which (in that case) they would have most wished to exclude.

And yet so little anxiety do they show under this head, that, without so much as a single exception, *every* phrase they use, and *every* incident they record,

[1] The words "her first-born" are omitted in ℵ, B, Z, &c., and must be regarded as uncertain.

tends directly to confirm an error which, if it be an error, they could again and again have rendered impossible by a single line of explanation, or even by a single word;—nay, even by using correct and accurate expressions instead of others which, if it be necessary to believe in the Perpetual Virginity, were, strictly speaking, inaccurate and incorrect. If it were indeed "heretical," as was asserted by third and fourth century dogmatists, to doubt whether Scripture taught the Perpetual Virginity of the Virgin, could any expressions have been more unfortunately conducive to heresy than such a verse as Matt. iii. 55, "Is not His mother called Mary? and His brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?"

a. For, to take, first, the theory of St. Jerome, if these brethren of Jesus were in reality His *cousins*, what answer can be given to the question, *Why did not the Evangelists call them so?* Certainly not that they had no word expressive of that meaning. Such words were ready to their hands in the Greek *anepsioi*, or *sungeneis*—"cousins" or "kinsmen"—or in very common periphrases.[1] With such terms they were perfectly familiar. If James, and Joses, and Simon were habitually called "*brothers*" when they were only "*cousins*," it can only be said that they were needlessly and systematically misnamed.

But, it is said, the Hebrews used terms of relationship very vaguely, and, in accordance with their usage, our Lord's cousins would quite normally have been called His brethren.

Now, although this assertion has been repeated

[1] ἀνέψιος, Col. iv. 10 (incorrectly rendered "sister's son"); συγγενής, Luke i. 36; ii. 44; xiv. 12; John xviii. 26, etc.

by writer after writer down to our own day, it is quite untenable.[1] There are four senses of the word "brethren." (1.) There is the *general* sense in which it is applicable to all mankind. (2.) There is the narrower sense in which it is applied to men of the same race, nation, or creed, or to dwellers in the same town. (3.) There is the still narrower sense in which it is applied to all members of the same kin or family. And all these being metaphorical senses, there is (4.) *the only proper and literal sense* in which it means the sons of the same, or of one of the same, parents.[2] Now certainly the term "brethren" might have been applied emotionally, or metaphorically, or loosely, or on any pecial occasion, to the Lord's cousins, or He may so have addressed them by way of affection.[3] But to assert that

[1] I insisted strongly on this point in an article on the word "Brethren" in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, nearly twenty years ago; but, so far as I am aware, the point has never been noticed, and the objection never answered. One of the latest popular editors of the Epistle of St. James can still repeat, "that in Holy Scripture there are four senses of brotherhood, namely, of blood, of tribe, of nation, and of friendship, and *the three last of these will all apply to the case in point*." To talk thus is to ignore the dictates of common sense. We might just as well argue that any two persons who, through four different historical records, were invariably called "brothers," were perhaps only Freemasons, who are often called "brethren." The source of this mistake (as of so many others) seems to be St. Augustine, *Evang. Tract. in.* S. Jo. xxviii. 3: "Consanguinei Virginis Mariae fratres Domini dicebantur. *Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos et cognationis propinquos.*"

[2] When Bishop Wordsworth and others speak of the words "brother" and "sister" in the New Testament being used for "cousin" "in the Hebrew sense," on what basis does this strange generalisation rest? *In the New Testament there is not a single instance of such a usage.* In the Old Testament (*i.e.* in a literature which spreads over a thousand years) the Hebrew word אָח is used *twice only* in a loose general sense. In every other instance (not *metaphorical*) it has its proper meaning. The sacred writers usually mean what they say.

[3] This is unlikely, because He never so addressed even John, the disciple whom He loved.

"cousins" could be called "brothers" in ordinary prose, time after time, throughout a perfectly plain and simple history, with no hint whatever that they were *not* "brothers" in the everyday sense, and always in connexion with the *actual* mother of Him whose "brothers" they are called—and not seldom when His mother with these "brothers" appear together on the scene with a desire to check, or control, or dictate to their Divine kinsman—is to assert something for which no analogy is to be found either in Semitic or any other literature in the whole world. No language could be contented with the use of terms habitually misleading. In this case such a form of speech would not only be misleading, but could only be termed a direct encouragement to views which theologians have attempted to represent as all but heretical. That John and James, the sons of Zebedee, were first-cousins of our Lord may now be regarded as a nearly certain conclusion. If, on the common theory, His *other* cousins, who "did not believe on Him," are *always* called His "brethren," how comes it that this term is never once or by any chance applied to these first-cousins who *did* believe on Him, and of whom one was His specially-beloved disciple? But to refute the Hieronymian theory again—though there will probably be found commentators to repeat it till the end of time—can only be regarded as a slaying of the slain; like the soldier in Ariosto,[1] it goes on fighting without being aware that it is dead.[2]

[1] "Il pover' uom che non sen era accorto
Andava combattendo, ed era morto."
—*Orland. Innam.*

[2] St. Jerome quotes no tradition in its favour; speaks of it very waveringly; and finally (*Ep. ad Hedibiam*) seems to abandon it, or at

The whole theory sprang from a notion that it would be derogatory to the dignity of the Virgin, or of our Lord, that she should subsequently have become a mother of children born in ordinary wedlock. Such a theory, I freely admit, might better accord with our *à priori* conceptions. But can we venture to hold it if the natural interpretation of so many Scripture passages seems to point the other way? The only text which has ever been quoted from the whole range of Scripture in favour of the Aeiparthenia, or Perpetual Virginity, is Ezek. xliv. 2. It is—"This gate shall be shut and shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it, because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it; it shall be shut." But to quote such a verse in these days as possessing any controversial value on this question is an insult to common sense. If such allusions can be so applied, then we can prove anything whatever. Can it be called anything short of a deplorable Kabbalism to make such a use of a description of the Eastern Gate of the Prophet's mystic Temple, into which "the Prince" was to enter by "the porch," and in which he was to sit "to eat bread before the Lord"? If such perversions of Scripture were permissible, it would then be quite fair to say of the Bible—

> "Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque
> Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua."

The belief in the Aeiparthenia—of which there is no trace in the Church for centuries—had its origin in two

least to regard it with complete indifference. It had served the purpose of exalting Virginity when he wrote against Helvidius in A.D. 383; but twenty-three or more years later (A.D. 406) he has ceased to regard it as important. (See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 248.)

tendencies, both perilous, both unscriptural. The one —the tendency to exalt the Virgin to superhuman dignity—is markedly ignored, and even discountenanced, in Scripture. The other—the tendency to disparage the wedded state, and to exalt celibacy into a counsel of perfection—is not only discouraged in Scripture, but had its root in dangerous heresies, and runs counter to the express and repeated teachings of Holy Writ.

Every Christian will feel that the Mother of the Lord ought to receive the deepest honour and reverence. She was highly favoured, and could not have been thus selected out of the myriads of the human race to be the mother of the Saviour without the possession of conspicuous gifts and graces. Yet, as though with definite purpose, she is left in the depths of her almost unbroken seclusion and reserve. In some of the few instances in which this silence respecting her is broken, she is by no means singled out for special commendation. After the return of Joseph and Mary with the child Jesus to Nazareth, she is only mentioned or alluded to on six or seven occasions. One of these was when she and Joseph lost Jesus, and finding Him in the Temple, she addressed Him in words of sorrowing and almost reproachful wonder, and understood not His reply.[1] Another was when, at Cana, in answer to her faint suggestion that He should work a miracle, He said to her, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"[2] A third—and perhaps a fourth—was when she came with His brethren—who "did not believe on Him"—to seek Him,[3] and even, as St. Mark tells us, "to lay hold on Him,"[4] thinking that His enthusiasm, which they could

[1] Luke i. 50.
[2] John ii. 4.
[3] Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 31; Luke viii. 19.
[4] Mark xi. 21.

neither measure nor understand, was getting the better of Him. On that occasion, as though with the express view of discouraging every attempt to exalt His relatives after the flesh, He exclaimed, as He looked round on those who were sitting about Him, "Behold my mother and my brethren!" And, again, when a woman of the multitude exclaimed, in a burst of emotion, how blessed His mother must be, His public reply had been, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it."[1] We catch but one more glimpse of the Virgin. Seeing her as she stood beside the cross, our Lord said to St. John, "Behold thy mother," and to her, "Woman, behold thy son."[2] After this her name occurs for the last time in Scripture in the passing mention of the fact that she, with His brethren—unbelievers in Him no longer—was present in the gatherings of the faithful disciples for purposes of prayer and supplication, which filled up the period between the Ascension and the Day of Pentecost.[3] On which of these notices can we found the dogma of the Aeiparthenia or of the Immaculate Conception?

But, it will be said, our Blessed Lord consigned her to the care of His beloved disciple, and not to the care of His "brothers." That circumstance needs no explanation. St. John was the Virgin's nephew. He was nearer and dearer to Jesus, in accordance with His own express declaration, than any of His brethren were. They were absent from the cross;[4] St. John was

[1] Luke xi. 28. [2] John xix. 26.

[3] Acts i. 14

[4] It cannot be said that this is an *argumentum ex silentio*; for (1) as this is the *only* place in the Gospels after the visit to the Temple in which the Virgin alone is mentioned without the brethren, this is a clear indication that they were not with her; and (2) the whole tenor of the narrative

present. They had been absent from Him all through the darker and more troubled phases of His ministry; St. John had accompanied Him through them all. They had not been at the Last Supper; St. John had then leaned his head upon His breast. They had not been with Him at Gethsemane; St. John had been one of the chosen three. They had addressed Him dubiously, almost reproachfully, on the occasion of His going to the Feast of Tabernacles;[1] St. John had been His chief companion. The Lord, as He Himself bore testimony, had been no prophet "*in His own house*," any more than in His own country. His brothers, therefore, were less suited than St. John to take care of that precious charge. And, further than this, we have reason to infer three facts about St. John's position which were not applicable to theirs, and which, besides the sweetness and nobleness of his nature and his dearness to Jesus, made him exceptionally suited to give a home to the suffering Mother. One was that he had a home in Jerusalem, which they had not; another, that his circumstances were more prosperous than theirs, which would have enabled him to feel no burden in undertaking the support of Mary; a third, that he alone had powerful friends at Jerusalem, which might enable him to render her position more secure than it could have been in the lodgings of struggling Nazarenes. On any hypothesis, the Virgin was removed to another home; she lived no longer with those brothers of the Lord with whom up to this time she had always been associated.

leads us to believe that but few of our Lord's relatives or followers stood beside His cross, and that those few are all mentioned.

[1] John vii. 1—10.

To what lengths the tendency to exalt, beyond all warrant of Scripture or reason, the dignity of the Blessed Virgin has led, we have seen even in our own age, in the adoption of the dogma that she was born sinless. There is no further need to dwell upon this tendency. But the notion of the Aeiparthenia was aided by the growth of erroneous views respecting the supposed degradation, or comparative unworthiness, of marriage. It is assumed that the Virgin would have been dishonoured by subsequent motherhood. Where is there any Scriptural or other warrant for such a notion? It may be certainly affirmed that such a notion was unknown alike to the Jews and to the early Christians.[1]

And in the view of all those who regard holy wedlock as *no* stain and *no* disparagement, but as a sacred and blessed institution, the Virgin-mother is in no way lowered from that high blessing which she received from the annunciation of the angel by receiving the after-blessing of sons and daughters, a blessing which cometh from God alone.[2] And so far is the Divine dignity of the Son of God from being lowered by such a circumstance—in that human humiliation which was to Him the appointed path of His perfectionment[3]—so far was it from being derogatory to Him to live in the same house with "brothers" and "sisters," the children of His mother, that, on the contrary, there is something

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 3; Col. ii. 18—23; 1 Cor. vii. 5 (on which see *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 70). And for Jewish opinion see Bava Bathra, f. 116 *a*; Pesachim, f. 113 *b*; Nedarim, f. 64, *b*; Kiddushin, f. 29 *b*; Yevamoth, ff. 62, 63, as quoted by Hamburger, etc.

[2] Even Tertullian, in spite of his glorification of celibacy, seems to have held the same view as Helvidius.

[3] Heb. ii. 10.

inexpressibly beautiful and consoling in the thought that He, too—as part of that sympathy with us, which was one of the great qualifications for a High Priesthood which could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities—knew to the full the dignity, the happiness, the innocence, the holiness of family life. Such a life—the deep and helpful love of brothers and sisters bound together in a common bond of resistance against the perils, of consolation amid the trials, of joy in the happiness, of the world—is one of the most beautiful and sacred spectacles which earth can offer. It forms yet one more link of union between us and our Saviour, if He shared with us this, as well as every other relationship of life in which it was possible for Him to share at all. If I held the common sentiment that the Virgin would have been *dishonoured* by the ordinary family relationship—if I shared the Apollinarian tendency to obliterate as much as possible all traces of those things which our Lord had in common with our ordinary human life,—then I too might be tempted to succumb to the force of those sentiments which in this matter have led so many to interpret the Gospels in a non-natural sense. But I hold it to be a paramount duty to interpret Scripture by what it says, and not by our own fancies as to what it *ought* to say. I also hold that our Lord came to ennoble and glorify our human nature in all its normal conditions, and that all His teaching is opposed to notions of ceremonial as apart from moral sanctity, and to all Gnostic, or Manichean, or Essene, or monastic fancies. He never breathed one word to exalt the celibate over the wedded life, and to attribute to that age the glorification of the celibate *in* the wedded life is an immense anachronism. I am unable

to accept the arguments which still lead so many to turn the word "brothers" into "cousins," or to borrow apocryphal fictions to help out a theory of married relationship known to the traditions of mediævalism, unknown to the Scriptural simplicity of Jewish family life.

These, then, are the considerations which, to my mind, give the main force to what is called the Helvidian theory—the theory that the Lord's "brothers and sisters" really were the children of His mother.[1] It is really no theory at all, but an acceptance of what the Gospels seem to say. I regard it as possible—nay, even as probable—that the sons of Alphæus, of whom two or more were Apostles, were, like the sons of Zebedee, the first cousins of Jesus; but I do not believe they were ever called His "brothers."[2]

2. There is, however, yet another theory, which is more plausible than that of St. Jerome, and which may be accepted by any who can be satisfied with such evidence as is adduced for it. It is the theory which Bishop Lightfoot has called the Epiphanian, because it seems to be first definitely maintained by Epiphanius,[3] A.D. 367. This is the theory that "the Lord's brethren" were the children of Joseph by an earlier marriage. It is adopted by Theophylact under the form that they were his children by a Levirate marriage with the widow of his brother Clopas. Modern

[1] It is accepted by Neander, Blom, Meyer, Stier, Alford, Schaff, etc.

[2] The well-known story of the Desposyni (*supra*, p. 218) obviously accords far better with the view that our Lord's brethren were, in the Helvidian sense, His brothers than with any other.

[3] Bishop Lightfoot has rendered a great service in correcting the error that the Papias who is quoted (Mill, *Mythical Interpretation*, p. 291) in support of the Hieronymian theory, is Papias of Hierapolis. He is a Papias not of the second, but of the eleventh century.

writers, again, have regarded them as adopted nephews, whose father was dead. These variations show that we are in the region of conjectural tradition rather than of traditional evidence. But the *general* notion that "the brethren" were children of Joseph and not of Mary derives such support as it may from the Apocryphal Gospels. They show what was a popular belief in the second and third centuries. That they show nothing more will, I suppose, be conceded by every one; and the measure of value which we are to attach to such popular belief is shown by the monstrous and even abhorrent fictions in which these Apocryphal Gospels abound. A support which comes from a source so radically tainted is not one on which we can rely. In fact, St. Jerome contemptuously dismisses this theory under the name of *deliramenta apocryphorum*—"*apocryphal ravings*." These fictions originated the notion that Joseph was an old man, and that he had sons who were grown up when Jesus was born. One of the oldest of these Apocryphal Gospels is the Protevangelium of James,[1] which, however, either blunders in saying that Joseph had no daughter,[2] or does not hold to the Perpetual Virginity. The Gospel of pseudo-Matthew calls James "the first-born son of Joseph,"[3] which does not in any way decide the ques-

[1] See, too, the Gospel of Joseph, and the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy.

[2] Mark vi. 3.

[3] How purely arbitrary were the inventions about the relationships of the Holy Family appears from the genealogical details furnished in this apocryphal writing, which may be thus tabulated:—

Joachim = Anna = Cleophas (by a second marriage).

= Joseph = The Virgin Mary. Mary = Alphæus.

James, Joseph, Judas, Simon. Philip and James the Little.

tion; and the story which, in common with the Gospel of Thomas, it tells about James being bitten by a viper, and healed by Jesus, seems to be a confused echo of a story which, in distorted forms, was current in the Rabbinic schools.[1]

Such is the evidence for this Epiphanian theory. Its first respectable support comes at the close of the fourth century, and its earlier traces are only found embedded in worthless and pernicious forgeries. If there are any who consider such evidence sufficiently strong to overthrow the apparently straightforward indications of the Gospel, and the other difficulties on which I have here touched, I have no desire to combat their opinion. What I must myself regard as proven is, that James, the author of the Epistle, was not the son of Alphæus, and therefore was not one of the Twelve Apostles. Whether we embrace the view of Epiphanius, or that of Helvidius, is not a religious question. It is a question of literature and of criticism. It is the question whether we are to interpret the Gospels by their apparent meaning, or to correct them by imagined fitnesses, and by the confused combinations of apocryphal forgers. It is the question above all of the view which we take of the married life—whether, with some of the Essenes and many of the Gnostics, we regard it as involving something essentially impure, and therefore derogatory to the honour of the Virgin as the Mother of our Lord;—or whether we regard it as a holy mystery, which is so far from having in it any touch of earthly defilement, that it is deliberately, and again and again adopted as a type of the union between God and holy souls, between Christ and His

[1] Avodah-Zarah, f. 27 *b*.

spotless Church. Whichever view we adopt, we shall indeed be justified in stating the arguments which have led us to our conclusion; but to advance them with courtesy, and to hold them in perfect charity, will be a Christian duty, from which no amount of zeal and no intensity of conviction can for a moment hold us excused.

CHAPTER XX.

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF ST. JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER.

"Thy Nazarites were purer than snow."—LAM. iv. 7.

It is one of the signs of the inimitable truthfulness and power of Scripture, that again and again, by a few simple touches, it enables us to realise the character of those of whom it speaks. There are many whose lives, as recorded in Holy Writ, would only occupy two or three verses, whom, nevertheless, from the inspired power with which they are delineated, we are enabled to represent to ourselves in their distinctest personality. Still more is this the case when we also possess some of their utterances and writings. And such a picture we can paint of St. James, first Bishop of Jerusalem, one of the "brothers of the Lord."

Even of his childhood and training we can form some conception. Whether he were a half-brother or only a step-brother of Jesus, tradition and Scripture alike tend to show that he was brought up with brothers and sisters in the lowly home at Nazareth. Joseph was but a village carpenter, and, as tradition says, by no means a skilful one. A carpenter at an outlying Galilean village must of necessity have been poor. But there is an immense chasm between poverty and pauperism. The circumstances of Eastern life take away all the sting from the condition of the industrious poor.

The wants of life are there reduced to their simplest elements. There is no wasteful luxury, no extravagant display. A little bread, a few dates, a spring of water, a humble cottage, a single change of raiment, are enough to support the honest labourer in dignity and contentment; and these he can earn with ease and certainty. Where there is no envy in the heart, where restlessness and ambition are under due control, such a state of life is not only tolerable—it is endowed with special elements of happiness. There must, we may be sure, have been many who sat around our Lord as they listened to the Sermon on the Mount who could understand from happy personal experience the beatitudes pronounced upon the poor who were also poor in spirit.

It will be needless to touch once more on that course of a Jewish boy's education which I have already described in the Lives of Christ and of St. Paul. We know how the Scriptures of the Old Testament formed the very staple of a boy's training in every genuine Israelitish family,—how the children began to learn them at five and continued the study until manhood, only adding to them the teachings of the Scribes.[1] Those teachings, under the two forms of Halachoth and Hagadoth—the one mainly consisting of ceremonial rules, the other of imaginative legends—were first collected in the second century by Rabbi Judah the Holy (Hakkodesh), into the Mishnah.[2] In the course of centuries they grew, by the constant accretions of the Gemara, until they now fill the twelve folio volumes of the

[1] Judah Ben Temah in *Pirkè Avoth*. v. 21: "At five the Bible, at ten the Mishnah, at thirteen the commandments, at fifteen the Talmud, at eighteen marriage, at twenty trade, at thirty full vigour, at forty maturity, at fifty counsel," etc.

[2] Rabbi Judah the Holy was born about A.D. 130 and died A.D. 190.

Jewish Talmud. We cannot, of course, tell with any certainty how much of the teaching existed at the beginning of the Christian era; but the essence of Jewish teaching at that day consisted in the repetition of precedents and opinions, and a large body of these precedents and opinions are attributed to Hillel and Shammai, and other great Rabbis partly contemporary with, partly anterior to, the days of Christ. Again, how much of this teaching was likely to penetrate into the families and schools, if schools there were, of the despised Galilean village is a matter of still greater uncertainty. But the discourses of Christ show that He was familiar with the conceptions which lay at the heart of the Rabbinic system;[1] and when He came to an open rupture with the Pharisees of Jerusalem, He showed His intensest disapproval of the spirit which identified their ritualistic observances and stereotyped formulæ with true religion. The language of St. James shows that, in later days, at any rate, he had accepted the truths which the Lord had taught. Until the time of his conversion he may have held the Pharisaic traditions in higher estimation. The essence of Pharisaism consisted in the extravagant exaltation of the Law, in its ceremonial no less than in its moral elements, and in the endless developments of pedantic scrupulosity into which its regulations had been expanded. The object of these developments was to enclose the Law in a hedge of separatism,[2] out of which no Jew could break without threats of excommunication, and into which no Gentile could force his way with any promise of advantage, unless he accepted the seal of the cove-

[1] Matt. xxiii. 16—22, 25; Mark vii. 5—13; &c.

[2] From this word—*perishuth*—the name Pharisee is derived.

nant, abandoned his Gentile antecedents, and became a Proselyte of Righteousness. Whatever may have been the earlier opinions of St. James, he ultimately learned to regard even the Levitic Law as a yoke too heavy for Gentiles to bear;[1] and he lived to teach the Jews of the Dispersion that the only ritual which was pure and undefiled before God was the ritual of Christian tenderness, the activity of Christian love.[2]

But whether he had been trained or not in the traditional expansions of Judaic scholasticism, we know that he was a rigid adherent of the Mosaic Law, and a faithful maintainer of the Levitical worship. His father Joseph[3] is characterised by St. Matthew as "a just man." This word conveys to Jewish ears a more definite meaning than it does to ours. It means not only that he was fair and honourable and upright, as we see that his conduct was in every incident of Christ's nativity and infancy in which he bore a part, but also that he made it his special study to meet all the requirements of the Mosaic Law. A "just man" was one who gave tithes; who went to the yearly feasts; who kept the one yearly fast; who was scrupulous in the observance of the Sabbath; who attended the Synagogue; who used the prescribed prayers; who observed the rules of Levitic purification; who reverenced the great Rabbis; who wore fringes and phylacteries; who made a constant study of the commandments, the precepts, the judgments, the testimonies, the

[1] Acts xv. 10, *seqq.* He listened without protest to the startling language of St. Peter, who also said that it was too heavy for "our fathers."

[2] Jas. i. 26, 27.

[3] Joseph was his father on the "Epiphanian" hypothesis as much as on the Helvidian.

Law, the word, the will of the God of the Covenant of his fathers.[1] To be a just man, according to the Jewish ideal, was to be "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.[2] And this was the aim of the Holy Family. Not only did Joseph go up to Jerusalem to the Feast of the Passover, but Mary accompanied him, though, in consequence of the fatigue and the perils of the journey, it was deemed unnecessary, and what the Schoolmen would have called "a work of supererogation," for women to accompany their husbands.[3] It is certain, then, that St. James was educated in an atmosphere of rigid Judaism, perhaps not untinged with that fervid patriotism and unbounded appreciation of the privileges of the Jewish people which was characteristic of the Galileans,[4] and which, unless duly controlled, might easily degenerate into fierce fanaticism and haughty exclusiveness.

But in St. James these tendencies assumed the nobler form of a morality which was not only energetic, but even stern in its holy severity. He had grown up amid men and women of beautiful and simple natures—among those whose souls wore, "when they looked without, the glow of sympathy; when they looked within, the bloom of modesty." Of his other brothers we know nothing, but we trace the same characteristic features in the mind of his brother St. Jude. May we not suppose that "the steady love of good and the steady scorn of evil" may have been intensified in their minds to a rare degree by their intercourse with ONE

[1] Ps. cxix.; Matt. i. 19; Luke xviii. 12. [2] Luke i. 6.

[3] Such had been the decision of Hillel.

[4] Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 1, § 6; *Vit.* 19, and passim, *B. J.* iii. 3, § 2.

Who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners? Perhaps we may trace one result of that intercourse in the intense belief shown by St. James in the efficacy of prayer. The duty and blessedness of prayer occupies no small part in the teaching of his Epistle;[1] and he speaks of it as one who had learnt the lesson from the Lord Jesus.[2] In this, and in all respects, must not the presence of the Son of God in that humble household of Nazareth have exercised a spell which could not but create in the hearts of good men a horror of vice even deeper than that which such natures would spontaneously derive from the training of righteous parents, and from their exclusive study of Holy Books?

In the writings both of St. James and St. Jude we find an intimate familiarity with the books of Scripture. The Bible had been their main library. In St. James we can even trace the portions of Scripture which had the deepest charm for him, and the impression which they had left upon his mind. He alludes to Abraham, to Rahab, to Elijah; he refers to the Pentateuch, to the Psalms, to Isaiah, and to the Prophet Amos. On a passage of the latter Prophet he founded the main argument of the speech which had so vast an influence on the spread of Christianity, and he echoes his views in two passages of the Epistle.[3] But the Old Testament writers whose spirit he had most fully imbibed are those whose teachings bear on that practical wisdom which the Jews called *Chokmah*. They held, and held truly, that they were

[1] See i. 5; iv. 2, 3, 8; v. 13—18.

[2] Compare the above passages with Matt. v. 44; xvii. 21, &c.

[3] Amos ix. 12 (Acts xv. 17), ii. 7, v. 12 (Ja. v. 4).

in possession of a moral "wisdom" which was the peculiar heritage of their race. It was not a "philosophy;" it was too little systematic, too much founded on practical experience and intuitions which transcended proof, to correspond to the ordinary meaning of that term. But the Hebraising Jews valued it so exclusively that they looked with unwise suspicion, and even with ignorant contempt, upon Greek and Roman lore.

Now the Jewish "wisdom" bore far more on conduct than on speculation. With this kind of wisdom the Epistle of St. James is largely occupied.[1] There is no book of the Hagiographa to which he more frequently refers than the Book of Proverbs.[2] "He has evidently caught his *tone* from the Prophets of his nation; but the *lessons* which he deemed to be of the highest importance are those lessons of "wisdom for a man's self" which recorded the long results of experience in the terse apophthegms of Solomon and of the school which he had founded.

But St. James had not studied the Scriptures only. It is not certain that our Lord ever alludes to the Apocrypha, though there are one or two passages in which it is possible that He does so. But both St. James and his brother St. Jude show a marked familiarity with apocryphal writings. St. Jude, as we have seen, makes a direct quotation from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, and alludes to other circumstances which he could only have derived from apocryphal tradition. In other words, St. Jude was in great measure what the Rabbis would have called a Hagadist, or one who dwelt on allegory, legend, and historical story more than on the legal precedents of the Halacha. There are no

[1] i. 5—8; iii. 13—17. [2] See *infra*, vol. ii. p. 20.

such legendary allusions in St. James; but, on the other hand, he shows a surprising fondness for the two best books of the Old Testament Apocrypha—the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. To these books he makes no less than thirteen references in the short compass of five chapters. These allusions, strange to say, are more numerous and definite than those which he makes to any of the books of the Old Testament. The reader will have an opportunity of estimating this fact by a reference to the parallels which I have mentioned farther on. It has been reckoned that he alludes more or less directly to the Book of Job six times, to the Book of Proverbs at least ten times, to the Book of the "Wisdom of Solomon" at least five times,[1] but to the Book of Ecclesiasticus—"the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach"—more than fifteen times.[2] It requires but a glance at his Epistle to see that what has influenced him most of all is the Sermon on the Mount, to which he has some fourteen allusions; but he has used its teaching to breathe new life into the beautiful though apocryphal treatise of the Son of Sirach, on which it is evident that he had deeply meditated. The fact is the more striking because in other respects St. James shows no sympathy with Alexandrian specu-

[1] If any further evidence should ever throw probability on the ingenious theory of Dean Plumptre that the Book of Wisdom was written by Apollos before his conversion to Christianity, it would be an interesting circumstance that there should have been these intellectual affinities between the head of Jewish Christianity and the great disciple of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

[2] The Talmud places among those "who have no portion in the world to come" (the *olam habba*) "those who read the books of outsiders" (ספרי החיצונים); and Rav Yoseph said "*that it was unlawful to read the Book of the son of Sirach*" (Sanhedrin, f. 100, *b*). On the other hand, it is referred to with respect in Yevamoth, f. 63, *b*.

lations. There is not in him the faintest tinge of Philonian philosophy; on the contrary, he belongs in a marked degree to the School of Jerusalem. He is a thorough Hebraiser, a typical Judaist. All his thoughts and phrases move normally in the Palestinian sphere. This is a curious and almost unnoticed phenomenon. The "Sapiential literature" of the Old Testament was the *least* specifically Israelite. It was the direct precursor of Alexandrian morals. It deals with mankind, and not with the Jew. Yet St. James, who shows so much partiality for this literature, is of all the writers of the New Testament the least Alexandrian, and the most Judaic.

But there is another fact about St. James which goes far to account for his position, his character, and the tone which he adopts, and which also throws an interesting light on the views of Joseph and of the Holy Family. It is that he was—if we may accept the testimony of Hegesippus, which is in this instance intrinsically probable—a Nazarite from the womb.[1] Joseph was called "a just man" in the sense which I have already explained; it was probably to the vow of the Nazarite that St. James owed his title of "the Just." The close of the Jewish age was an age of vows. The gathering of the eagles which were beginning to flap their fierce wings over the Holy Land awakened anguish and terror in the hearts of the Jews.[2] In the spirits of many of them, and not

[1] The sketch of St. James by Hegesippus is preserved in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23. Grätz has no ground for his assertion (*Gesch. d. Juden.* iii. 250) that St. James was in these particulars a representative of the Church; but I cannot agree with Mr. Sorley (*Jewish Christians*, p. 18) that the sketch is unworthy of credit, for it is confirmed by many incidental allusions in the Acts and Epistles.

[2] See 2 Esdras xi. 45.

least in those of brave and hardy Galilæans, the sense of peril kindled a flame of patriotism which showed itself in wild revolt.[1] In those who were unprepared for these movements—who did not hear the call from Heaven, which in the form of prophetic sanction or manifest opportunity would alone have justified an appeal to the sword—the sorrow of political extinction found its sure consolation in the Law of God. The beauty and purity of that Law had kindled the rapturous delight of the exile who wrote the 119th Psalm. In that golden alphabet of Hebrew faithfulness he found a compensation for every earthly trial. It was the desire to preserve that Law intact which, amid manifold aberrations, formed the nobler side of Pharisaism. In faithfulness to that Law—which he at last learnt to regard from the Christian standpoint as "a Law of Liberty"—St. James found the highest meaning of his life. To obey it in the most open manner became the vow of his life. A people suffering under oppression learns to value the force which is derivable from sacred vows. In vows the age of the Judges had found a spring of enthusiasm which helped them to win deliverance. The instances of St. John the Baptist and St. James—not to mention the Essenes or Banus the Pharisee[2]—show us that in the days of Roman oppression the Jews were once more learning the same lesson.[3]

As a Nazarite St. James would be regarded as holy

[1] The name "Galilean," though not, as has been erroneously said, almost identical with "Zealot," yet in common use denoted a certain amount of disaffection to the Roman Government (Matt. xxvi. 69; Mark xiv. 70; and Jos. *B. J.* iii. 3, § 2, &c.).

[2] Jos. *Vit.* 2.

[3] See Ewald, *Gesch. Volks Israel*, ii. 517.

even from infancy. The vow was one which devoted him to the cause of God. He never tasted wine or strong drink. He never ate any animal food. No razor had ever come upon the long locks which streamed over his shoulders. He never anointed himself with oil.[1] Although he must have constantly practised the ablutions which were an essential part of Levitic rule, he never allowed himself the effeminate luxury of the bath, which had been borrowed from the soft customs of Ionia.[2] The scrupulous cleanliness of Levitism, which arose from its abhorrence of defilement from any creeping thing, led him always to wear robes of pure white linen, because woollen substances could not be kept so absolutely clean. This would indicate a scrupulosity even greater than that of the Priests, for they ordinarily wore woollen garments,[3] although they might only be clad in linen while performing their sacred functions. The Nazaritism of St. James is a circumstance of great moment in the explanation of his life and character. It added strength to his personal influence. There are traces in Scripture that the Nazarites were regarded with peculiar pride. They were looked upon as endowed with health and

[1] See Hegesippus, *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23. ' This may be regarded as irreconcilable with the directions given in James v. 14; but the use of oil *medicinally* is very different from its use as a *luxury*.

[2] Βαλανείῳ οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. Some have been rather horrified by the expression of Hegesippus that St. James " never used the bath." But it must not for a moment be supposed that St. James approved of that revolting notion of "the holiness of dirt" which seems to have found a place in the minds of some of the hermits. The expression "the bath" seems to me to have a technical meaning, so that it might be said even of an Essene, in spite of his daily ablutions in cold water (Jos. *B. J.* ii. 8, § 5), that "he did not use the bath." See Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeitalt.* i. 141.

[3] Lev. xvi. 4; Ezra xliv. 17.

beauty, as well as holiness. "Thy Nazarites," says Jeremiah,[1] "were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing was of sapphire." They may even have been admitted into some of the functions which were otherwise confined to the Tribe of Levi. It cannot indeed be true that "because he was a Nazarite" St. James was allowed, like the High Priest, to enter the Holiest once a year. In making that statement Epiphanius[2] probably mistakes the remark of Hegesippus[3] that he was admitted into the Sanctuary (εἰς τὰ ἅγια). And this may be true. For if we read of Rechabites who were "scribes" and "singers," and were allowed "to stand before the Lord" in the service of the Sanctuary, though they were of Kenite blood,[4] the same was more likely to be true of Nazarites, especially if, like St. James, they were of priestly kin and of Davidic descent. At any rate, the Nazarites were pledged champions of Mosaic institutions,[5] and signs are not wanting that the vow of the Nazarite had been adopted by other members of the circle who were connected with the earthly home of Jesus.[6]

In the case of St. James, as in that of his kinsman John the Baptist, this life-long vow helps to account for

[1] Lam. iv. 7.

[2] Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix. 4; lxxviii. 13.

[3] Hegesippus, *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

[4] On the Rechabites see 2 Kings x. 15, 23; Jer. xxxv.; 1 Chron. ii. 55; Ps. lxxi., *inscr.*; and the allusion of Hegesippus to the Rechabite priest, *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

[5] Hence, perhaps, in part, the title borne by St. James of *Obliam*, or "bulwark of the people" (*Ophel am*), which Hegesippus confusedly says is "defence of the people, and righteousness."

[6] Thus we are told of St. Matthew—who, being a son of Alphaeus, was perhaps a cousin of St. James—that he only ate vegetables. (Clem. Alex. *Paed.* ii. 1.)

the tone of prophetic authority and fiery vehemence in which he speaks. May it not also account for "the little rift within the lute"—the gradual severance, if not alienation, from Christ of His earthly "brethren" which is traceable in the Gospels? It is probable that there was no disturbance of harmony so long as Jesus continued to live in the home of His childhood, and to work with the other members of His family as "the Carpenter of Nazareth." On the Divine instructiveness of that long epoch of seclusion—on the eloquence with which that silence teaches us some of the best and most necessary lessons of life—I have dwelt elsewhere.[1] We may well believe that those early years at Nazareth were exceptionally peaceful and blessed. But when the Lord's hour was come there fell a shadow between Him and those with whom He had been brought up. He went to be baptised of John in Jordan. He returned with a body of youthful disciples, of whom one was His first cousin, and who were subsequently joined by other relatives. But His brethren did not join that cluster of young men in all their glowing enthusiasm whom Jesus gathered round Him as the fresh garland of His ministry. He left His home: they stayed in it. They must have heard many a rumour of Him before He re-appeared in His native village. Of the secret of His birth, shrouded in awful reticence by the awe-struck humility of their mother, it may be that they had not heard. They had seen Him grow up as one of themselves, living in obscure poverty, toiling at a humble trade. Could they approve of the astonishing boldness with which—usurping, as it might seem to them, the functions of the greatest

[1] See my *Life of Christ*, i. 80—104.

Priests, or the most learned Rabbis, and even endangering the position of His countrymen with Herod, and with the Romans—He had swept the courts of the Temple clear from the crowd of chaffering traffickers? If such conduct showed a noble zeal, how could they approve of such a violation of all custom—such a disregard of all patriotic prejudices—as was indicated by His stay among the detested Samaritans? And how intense must have been their astonished disapproval when, in the Synagogue of Nazareth, they heard Him—Him with Whom they had all grown up side by side—proclaim Himself to be the promised Messiah of the Great Prophecy of Isaiah! His expulsion from Nazareth—the narrow escape from the death for "blasphemy" which His infuriated townsmen wished to inflict upon Him—the consequent disturbance of all their hitherto peaceful relations with their neighbours[1]—the necessity, arising from this disturbance, which compelled the whole family to migrate from a town endeared to them by so long a residence, and by so many associations—these and other circumstances must all have come upon them as heavy trials—trials which had arisen from the claims and the conduct of Him Whom men called their brother. All these circumstances would tend to produce the want of perfect cordiality to which our Lord alluded when He said that "a Prophet is not without honour except in his own country, and *among his kinsmen and in his own house*."[2]

[1] "Is not this the son of Mary, and the brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?"—Mark vi. 3.

[2] Mark vi. 4; Matt. xiii. 57; Luke iv. 24; John iv. 44. The last words are omitted, perhaps out of respect for the feelings of the Lord's brethren, by the two later Evangelists.

At first, however, they did not venture to interfere. With their strong Levitic prejudices, they must have heard with disapproval of His disparagement of the "traditions of the fathers;" of His indifference to the Oral Law; of His neglect of Levitic rules when He touched a corpse or a leper; of His graciousness to the poor woman, whose slightest contact involved ceremonial pollution; of His eating with unwashen hands; of His annulment of the distinction between clean and unclean meats; of His not observing the two weekly fasts; of the way in which He set at nought the common rules about the observance of the Sabbath. But the awe which He inspired hushed the voices which would otherwise have risen in remonstrance. It was only when the path of the "Prophet of Nazareth" seemed to darken—only when they found that He was arraying against Himself, first the disapprobation, then the indignant hatred, of all those on whom they looked with the deepest veneration—that they thought it a duty, if possible, to control His actions. It is difficult for us to realise how profound was the respect with which the humbler Jews looked up to the Priests, the Sanhedrists, the Pharisees, the Teachers of the Law. The titles which the Rabbis so eagerly accepted, the tone of contempt which they adopted towards those who were not initiated into their system, the insolence with which they depreciated all who did not belong to their little clique, had gradually led the mass of the Jews to accept these teachers at their own estimate, and to obey their decisions with almost abject humility. It was inconceivable to them how one of the people should dare to scorn the wisdom, to set aside the authority, to defy the injunctions of their idolised theo-

logians. It startled them that He should denounce as blind guides and pernicious hypocrites the men whom they had been accustomed to regard as little Ezras or Simeons—as "uprooters of mountains"—as "glories of the Law"—as men of whom the least was "worthy that the Shechinah should rest upon him."[1] They, too, were inclined to repeat, "Is not this the carpenter?" In the sixteenth century men marvelled at the audacity of the German monk who dared to breathe defiance against the immemorial majesty of the Papacy, and to brave the opposition of a compact ecclesiasticism. But the courage of Luther was as nothing to what Jews who did not accept the Divine mission of Jesus must have considered to be the daring of the Nazarene, who cared nothing for the threats of the Scribes and Pharisees who had been despatched from Jerusalem to watch His movements. How could one who "had never learnt letters," and knew nothing of what passed for "theology"—gaze without quailing on those broad phylacteries, and listen without reverence to that micrology of erudition? Was it not amazing that He should dare to teach with personal authority, and without any reference to the precedents and technicalities of men who had actually listened to Shammai and to Hillel! The brethren of Jesus could only attribute such conduct to an enthusiasm which seemed to be getting beyond His own control. They imagined that the Spirit of the Prophet was no more subject to the Prophet. *They said, "He is beside Himself."* Fortifying their interference with the presence of His mother, they went in a body to the

[1] The Rabbis, like the mediæval schoolmen, were distinguished by such flattering titles as "the glory of the Law," "the Holy," &c.

skirts of the vast crowd which He was addressing at Capernaum, and sent a message that they wished to speak with Him. It was an act of which they themselves were as yet incapable of understanding the immense irreverence. It was time that James and Judas should be taught, as Mary had been gently taught even at the wedding-feast of Cana, that for Him the bond of earthly relationships was transcended for ever. Stretching out His hand to His disciples He said, "Behold My mother and My brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of My Father in Heaven, *he* is My brother, and sister, and mother!"[1]

Yet even this repudiation of their interference—this rebuke, so distinct yet so gentle, of the presumption which relied on fleshly kinsmanship—was not effectual to silence finally the remonstrances of His "brethren." Once more—and this time they were unable to bring Mary with them—they ventured to proffer their advice to Jesus; ventured, not obscurely, to intimate their disapproval of His conduct, and their rejection of His highest claims.[2] The burst of unpopularity which had followed His discourse at Capernaum about the Bread of Life—the discourse in which He had checked the false Messianic enthusiasm excited by the feeding of the five thousand—rendered His position more and more isolated. So great was His peril that, though the Feast of Tabernacles was at hand, He could not go publicly to Jerusalem. It was at this sad crisis that His brethren came to Him, and said, with impatient perplexity, "Depart hence, and go into Judæa, that Thy disciples also"—not merely these few Galilæans, but those who have believed on Thee in Jerusalem and

[1] Matt. xii. 49, 50. [2] John vii. 1—10.

Judæa—"may behold the works that Thou doest; for no man doeth anything in secret"—as Thou art now practically doing—"and seeks to be publicly acknowledged.[1] If Thou doest these things"—and though the words are not a denial of His work they are at least a cold and hesitating acknowledgment—"if Thou doest these things, manifest Thyself to the world." This forward and ungracious speech, in which they ostentatiously separate themselves from His disciples, is accounted for by the remark of the Apostle, "For even His brethren were not believers on Him."[2] Their belief, such as it was, was neither permanent nor deep. They may have given to His claims a general acceptance,[3] but their faith was lacking in energy and depth. Had it not been so, they would never have aspired to control His actions. Once more His calm words involved a deep reproof: "My opportunity has not yet come; *your* opportunity is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth because I bear witness concerning it that its deeds are evil. Go ye up unto the feast. I do not mean yet to go up unto this feast, because my opportunity is not yet fulfilled." Accordingly He did not go up to the feast publicly, or with them, or as one who went to observe it; He only appeared in the Temple suddenly in the midst of it. But what a severance between Himself and them the words reveal! How marked is the emphasis of the contrasted pronouns! How unmistakably do His words imply that *they* belonged as yet to the world of Judaism and Pharisaism; to the world which hated

[1] John vii. 4: *ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ εἶναι.*

[2] Ver. 5: *οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν.*

[3] Such as is expressed by *πιστεύειν τινι*, but not by *πιστεύειν εἰς*

Him; to the world in which *they* were in no sort of peril, but which was seeking to take *His* life. *They* were members of the religious world; they sided with the dominant parties; they walked in the odour of sanctity; they were breathing the beatitude of orthodox benediction. *His* was the isolation and the persecution of the Prophet—of the Prophet who awoke the deadliest of all forms of hatred—the hatred of professional partisans; the hatred which must ever be the meed of those who are not afraid to pluck off the mask of the hypocrite, to startle the slumbers of a false orthodoxy, and to expose the insincerity of a false pretence.

In the four Gospels we do not again hear of the brothers of the Lord. They were not with Him during the last scenes; they were not at the Last Supper; they were not in the Garden; they drew no sword for Him; they did not follow Him to the Hall of Caiaphas; they did not defile themselves for the feast by entering the Prætorium; they did not stand beside the Cross; they did not, so far as we know, visit with sorrowing gifts His tomb.

Yet, strange to say, when next we meet with them they have thrown themselves heart and soul into the struggling fortunes of the Church! It is after the Ascension. The Eleven have returned from the Mount of Olives, and go to the Upper Room, which is their regular place of meeting in Jerusalem; and in that Upper Room are not only the Eleven, but also Mary the mother of Jesus and His brethren.[1] From that moment as a body they disappear, and we hear no more of either Joses or Simon. But Jude lived to travel as

[1] Acts i. 14.

a Christian missionary, and to write the Epistle which bears his name; and James lived to furnish the nearest approach to a bishop which is to be found in the Apostolic age, and to be for twenty years a main pillar of the persecuted Church.

Whence came this marvellous change?

We have no account of it; we have no means of even conjecturally explaining it, unless the explanation lies in three words of the Apostle Paul. In his relation of the appearances of Christ after His Resurrection he says that He was seen of Kephas, then of the Twelve, then of more than five hundred brethren at once; "*then He was seen of James.*"[1] That this James means the Lord's brother, the head of the Church in Jerusalem, is clear, because when the Epistle was written the son of Zebedee was dead, and the son of Alphæus was unknown to Gentile Christians. They knew but of one James, the one whose authority was so highly venerated, and the only one whom St. Paul mentions by name. Three, and three alone, were singled out to be separate eye-witnesses of the appearances of the risen Christ on earth. One was the leader of the Apostolic band, the repentant Kephas; another was she who loved much, whose love made her last at the cross and earliest at the tomb; the third was the brother of the Lord.

Not a single further detail is added in Scripture respecting the appearances to Kephas and to James. But in the Gospel of the Hebrews—the most ancient and trustworthy of the apocryphal Gospels—we find the striking story that James had bound himself by an oath that from the hour when he had

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 7: ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ.

drunk of the Lord's cup he would neither eat nor drink until he should see Him risen from the dead. "Now the Lord, when He had given the cloth (*sindon*) to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him, and said after a while, 'Bring hither a table and bread;' and He took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, 'My brother, eat thy bread now, for the Son of Man hath risen from among those that sleep.'"[1] There are several circumstances here which show us indeed that we are in the region of the Apocryphal, for James was not present at the Lord's Supper, and there did not exist among the Apostles—in spite of all that Jesus had told them — any expectation of the Resurrection. Indeed, so far from the belief creating the conviction, we are expressly told of the incredulous astonishment with which they received the first Easter tidings. But though there may be some confusion in these details, there is nothing improbable, nothing which is unlike St. James's character, in the main facts of the tradition. That he loved the Brother with whom he had lived at Nazareth for thirty years we cannot doubt. Although he may have been unconvinced at first of His Divine claims, though he may even have yielded to doubts respecting His Messiahship, yet one into whose heart had sunk so deeply the lessons of sentence after sentence from the Sermon on the Mount could not have regarded Him as other than a great prophet from the earliest days of His public ministry. All his personal affection may have been stirred to its lowest depths by the knowledge of what He had suffered. His nascent and imperfect

[1] Jer. *De Virr. Illustr.* 2.

belief may have been greatly strengthened by the events which accompanied the Crucifixion, and which made so deep an impression not only on the awestruck Jews, but even on the heathen centurion. It is therefore far from impossible that when he heard the first reports of His resurrection, the subsequent intelligence that He had been actually *seen*—and not only by Mary of Magdala, but by Kephas, and by the Twelve, and by five hundred brethren at once—he may have bound himself by the not uncommon *cherem*, or ban, which the tradition records. He was a Nazarite, and bound by a general vow; he would now make a *special* vow neither to eat nor drink until he too had seen the Lord—until he had been thus thoroughly convinced that all which yet remained of his past doubts was wrong and vain. However this may be, we know on the testimony of St. Paul that a special vision was vouchsafed to him. We know further from sacred history that he became thenceforth, until his martyrdom, a faithful shepherd of souls, a tower of defence to the Church of Christ in the Holy City.

Seven or eight years elapse before we again hear of him,[1] and then it is merely a passing allusion to the fact that St. Paul saw him in Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, when he had been forced to fly for his life from Damascus. All the brethren at first—and therefore James among them—received the new convert, who had lately been so terrible an inquisitor, with fear and suspicion. When the generosity of Barnabas had rescued his friend from this painful isolation, Peter was the earliest to hold out to him the right hand of fellowship, and from that time James

[1] About A.D. 38.

seems also to have received him with kindness.[1] Even then St. James appears to have held some authoritative position in the Church, though he is distinguished from the Apostles. Since no other Apostle except Peter is mentioned, we may infer that they were not at Jerusalem at that moment. Indeed, the whole Church had been scattered by the storm of persecution which had been directed by Paul himself.

Six more years elapse before, in A.D. 44, we again meet with the name of James. In that year Herod Agrippa I., in trying to sustain the politic *rôle* of a national king, had taken the readiest method of pleasing the Jews by harassing the Christians. He had accordingly seized James the son of Zebedee, and put him to death. The selection of the elder son of Zebedee for a victim shows either that the burning zeal was still unquenched which in old days had earned for him and his brother John the surname of Sons of Thunder, or that he was at that time regarded as the leader in the Church at Jerusalem. Why that position was assigned to him rather than to Peter we can only conjecture. It may have been owing to his position, or to his connexion with Jerusalem, or to the fact that as the son of Salome he was the near relative of his Lord. No sooner had he been executed than, seeing the delight which the Jews had taken in his execution, Herod proceeded further to seize Peter. The angelic deliverance of Peter from prison thwarted the king's murderous designs; and when Peter went at once to the house of Mary the mother of John Mark, to remove the anxious fears of the assembled brethren before his flight from Jerusalem, he ended his hasty

[1] Gal. i. 18, 19.

narrative with the words, "Tell *James* and the brethren these things."[1]

The expression shows that James the Lord's brother had succeeded the son of Zebedee as the chief person in the mother Church. The twelve years had now elapsed during which, according to a probable tradition, the Apostles had been bidden to stay at Jerusalem before they scattered far and wide to preach the Gospel to all nations.[2] The stationary superintendence of the little body of Christians in the head-quarters of Jewish fanaticism was felt to be a position which belonged less fitly to any of the Twelve than to one who, though he might in the less technical sense be called an Apostle, was not one of the chosen witnesses to whom had been entrusted the evangelisation of all the world.

To James, therefore, the Lord's brother—not only *because* he was the Lord's brother, but because of the force of his character and influence—fell naturally and at once the office of Bishop of Jerusalem.[3] The appointment was eminently wise, and as Jerusalem was yearly visited at the great feasts by hundreds of thousands of pilgrims, of whom multitudes were Christians,[4] this position at once gave to the

[1] Acts xii. 17.

[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5, § 43, quoting the *Kerugma Petrou*; and Apollonius, *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18.

[3] Clemens (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1) says that he was appointed bishop by Peter and the two sons of Zebedee. Hegesippus says: διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, κ.τ.λ. It is amazing that Jerome should have ventured to render this "Suscepit Ecclesiam Hierosolymæ *post apostolos* frater domini Jacobus." It means "*with* the Apostles," and shows that James was not one of the Twelve.

[4] In Acts xxi. 20 we find the startling expression, "Thou beholdest, brother, *how many myriads* (πόσαι μυριάδες) there are of Jews who have believed."

Lord's brother an immense authority. He became a pillar of the Church;[1] and if it had been in the power of any one even at the eleventh hour to win over the people of the Ancient Covenant, he would have achieved the task. The shadow of an awful mystery clung about him as the earthly brother of Him Whose true Divinity as the Eternal Son of God was brought home more deeply by the Holy Spirit to the hearts of the disciples as year after year passed by. And this awe of his personality, enhanced among the Jews by his Davidic descent, was increased by the stern sanctity of his character. This was he —so men whispered, and we catch the echo of their whispers centuries afterwards—"who is wont to go alone into the sanctuary, and is found prostrate in prayer, so that his knees have grown hard and worn like a camel's, because he is ever kneeling and worshipping God, and asking forgiveness for the people."[2] "This is the righteous one." "This is *Obliam*, the bulwark of the people." "He is even allowed," they said, "like the high priest, to wear on his forehead the *petalon*, the plate of gold on which is inscribed Holiness to the Lord."[3] The latter notion is probably a symbolic expression translated into a fact,[4] for there is no trace that such a privilege was accorded to any one, even if he were, as James may have been, of Aaronic as well as of Davidic origin.[5] But it is not incredible that James may, as a Nazarite, have been allowed

[1] Gal. ii. 9.

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

[3] Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix. 4; lxxviii. 13.

[4] As is the case with the similar story told by Polycrates about St. John (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24).

[5] Mary was related to Elizabeth.

to share in some of the priestly privileges.[1] In any case, these stories must indicate that he was held in exceptional reverence, for legends only gather round the names of the greatest, just as it is only the loftiest mountain-tops to which the mists most densely cling. And every indication with which we are furnished shows that he was providentially fitted to give one last chance to all who would accept salvation, whether in the Jewish capital or amid the Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion. From the whole character of his views he would speak to them in a voice more acceptable than that of any other man.

In the narrative of the anger which arose at Jerusalem when the news arrived that Peter, not content with baptising Gentile proselytes, had actually lived in their houses and eaten with them, the name of James is not mentioned. Nor, again, are we told that St. Paul saw him in his hurried and unimportant visit, in the year of Peter's imprisonment, to carry alms from the Gentile Christians at Antioch to their suffering brethren, the "saints" of Jerusalem.[2] But five years later, about A.D. 50, when Paul and Barnabas went up a second time to Jerusalem for the settlement of the great question which was then agitating the Church, we again see St. James as the most prominent figure in that memorable Synod. The question whether the Gentiles were or were not to be circumcised—was one on the decision of which hung the entire future of Gentile Christianity. It involved the whole relation of the Gentiles to the Mosaic Law. I have elsewhere so fully entered into its bearing, and

[1] See *supra*, p. 521. Dean Plumptre refers to Maimonides, *Moreh Nevochim*, iii. 43.

[2] Acts xi. 30; xii. 25.

into the circumstances of the scene at which it was decided, that I must be content to refer to what I have there said.[1] But I may here repeat that the whole weight and responsibility of the decision rested with St. James, and that he rose on this occasion to a height worthy of his parentage and of his character. In the face of all the prejudices of his life—rising superior to the views of all the Rabbis, his predecessors and contemporaries—ignoring the wrathful murmurs and fanatical arguments of the Pharisaic Zealots, he decided in an opposite sense to what seems to have been expected of him. He, the Righteous—he, the Bulwark of Judaism—he, the priestly Nazarite, to whom, Christian though he was, even Jews looked up with reverence—he, who was so rigidly accurate an observer of all the precepts of legal righteousness—he, the very man whose name and authority had been claimed by the Judaic emissaries who had troubled the Church of Antioch by their insistence upon legal scrupulosity and Jewish particularism—he, whose name they afterwards abused in counter-missions to undo the teaching of St. Paul—he gave his voice in favour of the liberal view! Never, perhaps, did a result so awful in its responsibility depend on the wisdom of any single man. The assembly of Jewish Christians in the Holy City, seething with intense excitement,[2] hung on the lips of their Bishop, as, in the hush of awe inspired by his person and character, he rose with the long locks of the Nazarite streaming over his white robes, to close the discussion in which so many fierce passions had been aroused. The Pharisees had been insisting on the Law—the Law of Moses—the

[1] See *Life and Work of St. Paul*, i. 405—408.
[2] Acts. xv. 2.

sacred, irrevocable, fiery Law of Sinai, for the sake of which they thought the very world had been created—the Law, which the Saviour had Himself said that He came not to destroy, but to fulfil—nay, which He had personally fulfilled—nay, respecting which He had openly declared that no jot nor tittle of it should ever pass away. Who had the power to say that this Law which God had uttered from the rolling fire, with the sound of a trumpet amid myriads of angels—who should dare to say that any portion of it was special? that any utterance of it was evanescent? Who would dare to argue that it was meant for Jews only, and that it need not be adopted by proselytes, and that it had not been intended for all the world? Could even the Bath Kol itself, the voice from Heaven,[1] supersede its universal sacredness, or absolve, were it but one Gentile, from so much as the position of a phylactery or the colour of a fringe? Did not tradition say that all the souls even of nations yet unborn had been summoned to the awful mountain to hear that Law delivered? And be it remembered that these arguments were being uttered at Jerusalem, in the midst of, and to the knowledge of, a madly fanatical population—uttered, as it were, in the audience of those long centuries of Sacred history to which every tower and pinnacle of the Holy City was bearing witness—uttered by men who were not only Pharisees, but Christians. And let it be further remembered that every argument which

[1] See the memorable story in the Talmud, where the Rabbis repudiate even the testimony of the Bath Kol against one of their Halachoth. "It is not mysterious voices," said Rabbi Joshua, "but the majority of the Sages which ought alone to decide questions of doctrine" (Bava Metzia, f. 59 *b*). See my paper on "Christ and the Oral Law" in the *Expositor*, (v. 233).

they were urging was one addressed as it were in shorthand to the impassioned prejudices of the majority of the hearers; anticipated almost before its utterance by their quick and excited sensibility; weighted with the emphasis of those lifelong convictions, which come to be identified with the very essence of religion. Against this mighty current of obstinate Judaism, Paul, the once fierce Inquisitor and Persecutor—Paul, the hated renegade of the Sanhedrin—Paul, who had his share in the death of the proto-martyr—Paul, the suspected teacher of heathen customs which were the subversion of legal righteousness—Paul, and even Barnabas, tainted, as many of these Pharisees would have thought, by intercourse with "the enemy,"—would have struggled in vain. One tower of strength the wiser and larger-hearted party possessed in the advocacy of Peter; but Peter himself, though he adduced irresistible proofs of a Divine sanction for what he had done, had barely been able to justify, at Jerusalem, the isolated baptism and admission into fellowship of a single pious proselyte. The question now at stake was not the treatment of an individual case, but the obligations of the whole Gentile world. Was the coming of the Jewish Messiah to be the annulment of the Jewish Law, the obliteration of all that was most distinctive in the Jewish Church? Was the triumph of Israel to involve its national effacement? Such were the questions which led to a storm of passionate dispute. But meanwhile, before the convening of this deeply-moved assembly, the result of which was to be fraught with consequences so momentous, Paul and Barnabas had, with consummate wisdom, secured the adhesion of the three great pillar-Apostles. Peter was already with them in heart; but Peter's impulsive

and yielding temperament might have been little able to stand alone against the rushing tide of fanaticism if he had not been supported by the authority of John and James. But John was won by the clear signs that God had been with the heroic missionaries, and that the Holy Spirit had set His seal on all their work. And when James also was convinced—when even *his* practical wisdom had grasped the truth, which was the last which the Holy Spirit made perfectly clear to the minds of the early Apostles—the greatest victory ever achieved by Gentile Christianity was won. The fiery speech of St. Peter might only have fanned the prejudices of the Jewish Christians into a fiercer flame. Even to the striking narratives of Paul and Barnabas they listened in unconvinced silence. They attached chief importance to the original Apostles and witnesses.[1] Their hopes were in James. And James arose to dash those hopes to the ground. He referred to the narrative of "Symeon;" he passed over in silence the speeches of Barnabas and Paul; but then—appealing to the words of a prophet who was a Nazarite like himself—with his "*Therefore I decide*" he settled the question.[2] And his decision was that the Gentiles were to be admitted into the Christian Church on the footing of proselytes of the Gate, and were not to be burdened with any requirements beyond the simple and easy rules of the Noachian Dispensation. I have pointed out elsewhere how many points of discussion were still left undecided by this decree; how local and how transitory was its authority; how completely, in Churches outside

[1] See *Clem. Hom.* xix. 17.

[2] Acts xv. 19. Two resemblances have been observed between the speech and the Epistle—(1) The epistolary greeting, χαίρειν (see vol. ii. p. 35); and (2) ἀδελφοί, ακούσατε (Acts xv. 13; Jas. ii. 5).

the limited circle to which the letter was addressed, St. Paul set aside its authority. I have also shown how openly the implied contract was also broken by those who were most hostile to the Apostle of the heathen, and who, appealing too often to credentials furnished by St. James, sophisticated St. Paul's feeble converts and undid his toilsome work. But, meanwhile, James himself, with worthy firmness and true wisdom from on high, had conceded the whole principle at issue. When the principle had been thus once conceded, it was, from the nature of the case, conceded for ever. The details could be safely left to future adjustment as they were seen by the light of circumstances. No one who called himself a Christian, whether Jew or Gentile, could really dispute a rule which had been laid down by the concurrent authority not only of Paul and Barnabas and Peter, but even of the Beloved Disciple and of the Brother of the Lord. But myriads of Jewish Christians remained secretly unpersuaded, until the destruction of Jerusalem like a lightning-flash from Heaven, dispelled their perplexities by the Divine logic of events.

Years again pass by, and we have but incidental references to the name of James. It is clear that if James was satisfied as to the right of St. Paul to act as he had done, many of his adherents were not. In violation of the whole spirit of the synodical compact, they insisted on maintaining a rigid line of distinction between Jews and uncircumcised Gentiles; and their presence at Antioch was so successful in reawakening the terrors of a fancied unorthodoxy that Peter himself once more wavered, and even Barnabas was led away with the dissimulation which followed the arrival of these "certain from James." It is not necessary once

more to write the history of that bitter quarrel which nearly rent asunder the unity of the early Church, and which it took a full century to heal. It is enough to say that the habits and convictions of a lifetime can never be lightly, and rarely with completeness, laid aside. Although St. James had shown on the one great occasion a noble liberality, yet his sympathies were to the last with the Jewish Christians. As the head of their party and the exponent of their views, he could never have felt in entire accord with the Apostle of the Gentiles. Hence his memory was fondly cherished by all Judaisers, and the Ebionites claimed his special patronage.[1] Peter was too wide in his sympathies, too free from narrowness and prejudice to be the chosen leader of so intensely Judaic a sect. The Nazarenes also, who were Judaists but not heretical, looked up to James with the highest reverence. In the Church of Jerusalem he was succeeded by Symeon son of Clopas, who is said to have suffered martyrdom, at the age of 120, in the reign of Hadrian. Every one of the next thirteen Bishops was of the Circumcision.[2] The first Gentile Bishop was Marcus (A.D. 137), who presided over the Church when some of the Christians had returned from Pella to Jerusalem, then called by its new name of Ælia Capitolina.

That St. James continued to the last to be swayed by the thoughts and traditions of his earlier life may be asserted without any blame to him. It is only what we see every day. The saints of God, who will be very

[1] In the pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Epistles he, and not Peter. is elected to the rank of supreme and universal Bishop. One Ebionite romance, the "*Anabathmoi Iakobou*," went so far as to describe his ascension into Heaven. Epiphan. *Haer*. xxx. 16.

[2] Euseb. iv. 5.

near and very dear to each other in Heaven, are on earth separated by bitter prejudices, by party shibboleths, by mutual misunderstandings, by the almost grotesque misrepresentations in which they mutually indulge. The Holy Spirit of God was with St. Paul, and with St. James, and with each of the Apostles, dividing to each man severally as He would. But there was a diversity of gifts and graces in accordance with the individuality of each; nor did the Holy Spirit bestow on any one of them an infallible wisdom or a perfect sinlessness. "Even a Paul," as St. Chrysostom says, "was still but a man." It is surely one of the heresies of modern times, one of the faithless misconceptions which alter the central meaning of Christianity, to suppose that the Holy Spirit, Who was promised for all time, was with the Apostles and is not with us. He is with us. He is with all who seek Him. But as it is alien from the possibilities of earthly life that His indwelling Presence should make us perfect or all-wise, so neither did it make them perfect or all-wise. They were mortal men, not angels. They were liable to inconsistencies, and they fell into errors. It is, I think, an unmistakable inference, both from the hints which we find in the Acts of the Apostles and from the silence of that book in other places, that St. James and St. Paul felt but little congeniality towards each other. They differed in sympathies and in temperament. No lives could be more diverse than those of these two great servants of God. St. Paul was constantly traversing Europe and Asia in long journeys, living in heathen cities, crossing and recrossing the Mediterranean, brought into daily contact with the rich though unsanctified culture of the grandest nations of antiquity,

seeing the works and learning the thoughts of many men. It was impossible for him to retain the Jewish standpoint when, by the wisdom of Providence, his mind had been enlarged by such influences and such knowledge. It forced upon him, in a way far different from that of theoretical assent, the conviction of God's fatherhood over the family of man. In the light of Christ's command to gather all mankind into the fold of His Church, the promises and prophecies which ran throughout the whole Old Testament flashed into new significance. The training which St. Paul had received from God's Holy Spirit, that he might become a true "vessel of election" to win the Gentiles unto Christ, shifted, as it were, the centre of gravity of his whole theological system. Theologically as well as geographically he was now aware that it was but a fiction of Rabbinism to regard Jerusalem as the centre of all the earth. The one thing which imperilled the conversion of the world was the attempt to force on the neck of the Gentiles a yoke of observances which they were unable to bear. It was impossible for St. Paul to dwell on the symbolism which gave to the Law its true splendour. What *he* had to enforce was its deathful, its menacing, its elementary aspect as a curse and a bondage. He was driven in the earnestness of controversy to use such expressions as "weak and beggarly elements," which we cannot imagine that St. James could under any circumstances have brought himself to use. We can hardly wonder if a polemic so unsparing, produced feelings of intense exasperation. The Rabbis applied to their hedge of Levitical Halachôth the expression of the Book of Ecclesiastes (x. 8), "Whoso breaketh down a hedge a serpent shall

bite him." St. Paul broke down that hedge in every direction—it was the duty and object of his life to do so—and he was bitten in consequence by the "offsprings of vipers." They whose work it is to win multitudes to Christ, to show religion in all its width and attractiveness, to make it wear a winning aspect in the eyes of all who love mercy and culture, have always aroused the alarmed antagonism of more timid natures.[1]

But the life and training of St. James, and consequently to a great extent the colour of his opinions, were the reverse of cosmopolitan. So far as we know, he never left Jerusalem after the Ascension. All that he learnt of the outer world was the glimpse of it which he received from intercourse with the Paschal pilgrims who came from "the Dispersion" with all their thoughts full of Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem alone. There was nothing in such intercourse to decrease, rather there was everything to intensify, the feelings of the Jew as to the grandeur and importance of his own privileges. Now the cause and substance of those privileges lay in the institutions which God had given him, and even more in the ceremonial Law, with its service and Priesthood, than in the moral law, which—in its great outlines—was common to the Jew with all mankind. A Christian Jew might concede that these institutions were not obligatory on the Gentile, at any rate to their full extent; but it was almost impossible for him to realise that they had become needless and insignificant shadows for himself also. They had been delivered from Sinai by the voice of God speaking out

[1] "Above all, let us not make the doors of the Church bristle with razors, and pitchforks, and bundles of thorns" (H. Peyrreyve to Père Lacordaire).

of the fire. How, then, could they become obsolete? Who had repealed them? When had they been annulled? Had any prophet greater than all the prophets reduced to a dead letter so much of the Levitic Books? Had Christ done so? There were those who argued that implicitly He *had* done so; but was the implicit and the inferential a sufficient warrant for the abrogation of that which was positive and Divine? Could it, moreover, be said with certainty that Christ had even implicitly set aside the Mosaic Law which He said He had come not to destroy, but to fulfil? If St. Paul appealed to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, others too, who thought that they had the Spirit of God, did not feel so sure as to their warrant for neglecting or undervaluing what was to them the certain revelation of 1,500 years ago.

Least of all could it be expected that one like St. James—a Hebrew of Hebrews, the son of a "just" man, and one whose own title of "the Just" was a testimony to the faithfulness of his observances, a Nazarite "holy from his mother's womb,"—would readily embrace such views. If he did, would not the Temple in which he worshipped, the vows in which he took part, the Holy Place in which he was permitted to kneel, the sacrifices which he offered, the streets of the city which he trod, the very robe he wore, bear daily witness against him? No doubt the Gentiles, if they chose, might be contented with the Noachian precepts; and the question as to the relative position of Jews and Gentiles, and of proselytes of the Gate in comparison with proselytes of Righteousness, might be left in abeyance. But to St. James Jerusalem was the joy of the whole earth, the City of the Great King.

To him "the people" meant the Chosen People, and the rest of the world was, in comparison, as nothing.[1] It had not been elected for exceptional blessings. It stood in a wholly inferior relation towards God. If such were not the views of St. James, they were the views of many of those Priests and Pharisees by whom he was surrounded, and with whom he lived in friendship. Many of these were only so far Christians that they recognised in Christ a Divine Messiah. They were Jews *as well as* Christians, and by the whole bent of their lives they were Jews first and Christians afterwards. To many of them, as we see from the New Testament, it was the strongest temptation of their lives to waver half-way between Judaism and Christianity, on the verge of apostatising into the former. It was not so with St. James. His heart was sure, his affections fixed, his soul anchored on the rock of Christ. He was a Christian first, a Jew afterwards, although his Epistle shows that it was the moral rather than the dogmatic side of Christianity which most absorbed his thoughts. But a man is insensibly affected by intercourse with those around him; and every circumstance around St. James was of a kind to deepen in his eyes the sanctity of Judaism. Those about him, often without his sanction, and sometimes in defiance of his wishes, did not scruple to make use of his name to discountenance the views of St. Paul. It was the position of St. James as the head of the Judaising Christians which made his name so dear to the Ebionites.[2] They

[1] Rabbis used to talk of all the world except Judæa as *chootsah-la-arets*, "outside the land."

[2] The "Ascent of James," the "Witness," and the "Protevangelion of James" were Ebionite writings. There are imitations of the Epistle of St.

were glad to attribute to *him* that bitter antagonism to the teachings of St. Paul which was true only of those who usurped his name. This is why, in the spurious Epistle of Peter prefixed to the Clementine Homilies, Peter is made to exalt the Law against the attacks of "the enemy," and none are regarded as full Christians but those who are devout and *circumcised.* This is why "James, the slave of the Lord Jesus Christ," becomes in the dedication of the Epistle of the pseudo-Clement, and in the Liturgy of James, not "the Lord's brother," but *Adelphotheos,* "the brother of God." He is spoken of, with the pompous inflation of a later sacerdotalism, as "the Lord James," "the prince of bishops, Apostles, and martyrs," "the bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the Holy Church of the Hebrews."[1] He is the Archbishop of Jerusalem, who, sending about even the greatest of the Apostles, at his own behest[2] despatches St. Peter to withstand Paul, "the enemy," thinly disguised in the person of Simon Magus. He stands seven days on the steps of the Temple witnessing (as though against the teaching of this "enemy"!) that Jesus is the Christ. In the Clementine Recognitions,[3] Peter—with pointed reference to the remark of St. Paul that he needed no letter of recommendation (2 Cor. iii. 1)—is made to give solemn warning to

James in the Clementine Homilies, iii. 1, 17, 54, 55; viii. 7; xix. 2 (*Ep. Clem. ad Jac.* 15).

[1] The forged letter of St. Peter in the Clementines is addressed "To James, the Lord and Bishop of the Holy Church," who is described as being at the head of a college of seventy Presbyters. The letter of pseudo-Clemens describing the martyrdom of St. Peter is addressed "To James the Lord, and Bishop of Bishops, who rules the Holy Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem, and all the Churches everywhere established by the Providence of God, etc." See too *Recogn.* i. 43.

[2] *Recogn.* i. 44, 68, 73. [3] *Recogn. Clem.* iv. 35; *Hom.* xi. 35.

the Church to test false Apostles, and "to trust *no* teacher who has not brought a testimonial" (as we may call it) "from James or from his successor; because, unless any one has gone up to Jerusalem and there been approved as being a teacher fit and faithful to preach the word of Christ, he is not by any means to be received." Such were the dreams and extravagances and ambitions and calumnies of party theology in the days of the Ebionites. Most of this Ebionising exaltation of Judaic episcopacy is the nonsense of an heretical and malignant ecclesiasticism, savouring of the elements which have ever been the corruption of all that is pure and sound and simple in the Church. But it bases its fictions upon circumstances which at one time did really exist, although to a much less extent than this. It had its root in the real differences between Judaic and Pauline Christianity. A passionate contest did really occur between those who wished to maintain intact and those who wished to annul the Levitic Law; and there may have been a want of heart-felt union between the leaders of the Church of Jerusalem and the great founder of the Church of the Gentiles. The state of circumstances which I have here sketched finds a striking illustration in the advice given by St. James and his elders, in A.D. 58, on the occasion of St. Paul's fifth and last visit to Jerusalem, when they recommended him to take a part in helping some poorer brethren to bring to due conclusion a temporary vow. That vow, with all its Levitic ceremonials, involved circumstances which could not but have been painful to St. Paul; and the recommendation, though given in all sincerity as a supposed means of averting a collision between Jews and Chris-

tians, produced the most disastrous consequences for many years.[1]

From that time forward we lose sight of St James in Scripture; but we gain one more glimpse of him in Jewish history and Christian tradition five years afterwards, in the year of his martyrdom, A.D. 63.

Respecting this martyrdom, Josephus tells us that it was due to Ananus, or Annas—or, to give him his true name, Hanan—the younger, who in that year was High Priest, the last of the high-priestly sons of the "Annas" of the Gospels. Hatred against Christ and Christians had already led the house of Hanan to imbrue their guilty hands in the blood of Christ and of St. Stephen, to approve of the murder of James the son of Zebedee, and to endeavour to procure the assassination of St. Paul. The same unrelenting animosity now hurried the younger Hanan, a man of violent and imperious temper, into a fresh crime. He seized a sudden opportunity to put to death the Lord's brother, and so to strike one more blow at the Christian Church. Festus, whose justice had saved the life of St. Paul, and who was one of the most honourable of the Roman procurators of Judæa, had died after a brief government of two years. Albinus was appointed as his successor, and before he arrived there was a little interval during which Judæa was only under the distant supervision of the Legate of Syria. Agrippa II. was absent from Jerusalem. At such a time a bold and cruel Sadducee like this High Priest, might easily induce the Sanhedrin

[1] See this fully explained in my *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 295—308. The Nazarite vow might be taken for a longer or shorter period, and one who undertook it for a period only was called "a Nazarite of days" (see Amos ii. 11, 12; 1 Macc. iii. 49). St. Paul's vow at Cenchreae may, or may not, have been of this character (Acts xviii. 18).

to stretch their authority, and exercise a power of inflicting capital punishment which had ceased strictly to belong to them. He hoped that this irregularity would be either unnoticed or condoned by the Romans, who were very tolerant of what was done in the interests of any legally-permitted religion, and who would not be likely to interfere with an execution which had no political significance. Inspiring the Sanhedrin with his own audacity, Hanan induced them to arrest James and other leading Christians, and to have them stoned. The charge brought against them was doubtless blasphemy, for it was impossible to charge James at any rate with "transgressing the Law." Perhaps, if James had been as much hated as St. Paul was, no more would have been said. But James, at Jerusalem, like Ananias at Damascus, was profoundly honoured by Jews no less than by Christians. He, too, was "a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there."[1] It was not merely the converts to Christianity, but "some of the most equitable in the city, and those who were most accurate in their knowledge of the Law," who were grieved at this wanton murder of the saintly Nazarite. They were determined to protect such citizens from the insolence of a blood-stained house, and they laid their complaints before Agrippa II. This king had heard the defence of St. Paul before Festus, and was capable of taking a fairer view of Christianity than that which was deemed politic by his astute and unprincipled father. They also complained to the new Procurator, who was now on his way from Alexandria to Jerusalem. The consequence was that Albinus (A.D. 63) wrote to Hanan a stern rebuke

[1] Acts xxii. 12.

for his illegal violence, and Agrippa II. felt that he might, without danger to his own popularity, expel him from the High Priesthood, though he had only held it for three months.[1] We can see from this brief narrative that the cruelty of the younger Hanan was only part of a bold plan to restore the waning influence of the Sadducean priesthood. Those who, by informing against him, defeated his purpose and drove him from his office, were evidently Pharisees.[2] The Pharisees were never actuated by the same animosity against the Judæo-Christians as the Sadducees. Judaic Christianity leaned to the views of Pharisaism. Sadducees like the Beni-Hanan naturally hated it on this ground, and all the more because the many Pharisees who had by this time embraced the faith were believers in the Resurrection of Christ, and were therefore extreme opponents of the very negation which was most characteristic of the Sadducean sect. Hanan is perhaps the proud young priest, who, on reproaching his father for conformity to Pharisaic practices while he had lived all his life in the profession of Sadduceism, received the answer that only at the price of such hypocrisy could their priestly position be maintained at all.[3] If so, we see that he was exactly the sort of person who would have taken the initiative in a Sadducean conspiracy.

Hegesippus supplements the narrative of Josephus by giving a more detailed account of the martyr's

[1] Joshua, son of Damnaeus, was appointed in his place, but was soon superseded by Joshua Ben Gamala, who bought the office by an enormous bribe, offered by his wife, Martha, a daughter of Boethus.

[2] Jos. *Antt.* xx. 9, § 1.

[3] *Tosefta Joma*, c. 1; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 112; Derenbourg, *Palest.* 104.

death.[1] He says that James won over many of the Jews to Christianity by his testimony to Jesus as being the Door of the Sheepfold, the Way of Life, until the multitude of conversions aroused, as it had done twenty-five years earlier, the angry attention of the Scribes and Sanhedrists. They accordingly sent him a deputation from their "Seven Sects" to ask him, "Who is the Door of Jesus?"[2] He answered, "that Jesus was the Saviour;" and by this testimony he again won so many converts that a tumult arose, from the fear that all the people would be won over to look for the coming of Christ. Accordingly they once more sent him a deputation, acknowledging his "righteousness," and the reverence with which they regarded him, and the strong influence which he held over the people, but entreating him to stand upon the pinnacle of the Temple on the day of the Passover and persuade "all the tribes" and the Gentiles "not to be led away concerning Jesus." The rest of the story may be told in the quaint style of the old writer himself:—

"The Scribes and Pharisees, then, who have been previously mentioned, set James on the pinnacle of the Temple, and cried to him and said, 'Just one! whom we ought all to obey, since the people is wandering after Jesus the Crucified, tell us, Who is the door of Jesus?' And he answered in a loud voice, 'Why do ye ask me again about Jesus the Son of Man? He both sits in the heavens on the right hand of the Mighty Power, and He will come on the clouds of heaven.'

[1] Hegesippus wrote, he tells us, when Eleutherus was Bishop of Rome, A.D. 174—189 (Euseb. iv. 22).

[2] The phrase may mean "Which is the door of which Jesus spoke?" (John x. 7, 9), or "What is the Door which leads to Jesus?"

And when many had been fully assured, and were glorifying God at the witness of James, and saying, 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' then again the same Scribes and Pharisees began to say to one another, 'We did wrong in affording such a testimony to Jesus. Come, let us go up and cast him down, that they may be afraid, and not believe him.' And they cried out, saying, 'Oh! oh! even the Just has gone astray!' and they fulfilled the Scripture written in Isaiah, 'Let us away with the Just, for he is inconvenient to us.' (Is. iii. 10 ?) Therefore they shall eat of the fruit of their own deeds. They went up, therefore, and flung down the Just, and said to one another, 'Let us stone James the Just.' And they began to stone him, since he did not die from being flung down, but turned and knelt on his knees, saying, 'I entreat Thee, O Lord God! O Father! forgive them, for they know not what they do.' But while they were thus stoning him, one of the Priests, of the sons of Rechab, a son of the Rechabites to whom Jeremiah the Prophet bears witness, cried out, saying, 'Cease! what are ye doing? The Righteous One is praying for you.' But one of them, one of the fullers, lifting up his club with which he used to beat out clothes, brought it down on the head of the Righteous One. So he bore witness; and they buried him on the spot, beside the Sanctuary.[1] He was a true witness to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. Immediately afterwards Vespasian besieged them." Eusebius quotes Josephus for the statement

[1] *Ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii 23 (quoting from the fifth book of the Hypomnemata). See, too, Epiphan. *Haer.* ii. 1 (where he quotes from Clemens Alexandrinus); lxxvii. 13, 14; Abdias, *Apost. Hist.* vi. 15. Kern's objection (*Tübingen Mag.*, 1835) to the genuineness of the Epistle of St. James, because Hegesippus does not happen to mention it, is surely insufficient.

that the destruction of Jerusalem fell on the Jews in punishment for his murder; but he exaggerates the remark in the *Antiquities*, unless he is quoting from passages of Josephus no longer extant.[1] The episcopal chair of St. James was, we are told, long preserved at Jerusalem as a relic.

Such is the story of Hegesippus, mixed up, no doubt, with legendary particulars, and consisting in part of a cento of Scripture phrases,[2] but bearing some marks of genuineness in the picture it presents of the estimation in which James was held, of his eminently prayerful character, of his courage, holiness, and devotion to the Law, and of the sympathy which he excited among those who like himself were partial Nazarites. And looking at his whole career in the light which was thrown upon it by later history, we cannot but see how merciful was the Providence which placed him in that sphere of labour, and made him what he was. If there was any voice to which even a remnant of Israel would listen, it was the voice of James. He venerated their Law, he observed their customs, he loved their nation, he attended their worship with scrupulous devotion. There are traces even in the Talmud of the deep influence which he exercised. There, among the chief *Minim*, or "heretics"—which is the ordinary Talmudic name for Christians—we constantly hear of a certain Jacob (*i.e.* James) of Kephar Zekania, who works supernatural cures in the name of Jesus son of Pandera. One of the stories about him is that Ben Dama, nephew of Rabbi Ishmael,

[1] He says that Josephus, in his 18th book, "openly confesses that Jerusalem had been destroyed because of the murder of James the Apostle." Josephus, in *Antt.* xx. 9, § 1, only says that his murder offended the most equitable citizens.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6; Luke xxiii. 34.

was bitten by a serpent, and James coming to him, offered to cure him after the fashion of the Nazarenes. Rabbi Ishmael forbade any recourse to such methods. "Suffer me," said Ben Dama, "to prove from the Scripture that this is lawful;" but before his proof was ready he died. "Happy Ben Dama," said his uncle, "in that thy soul hath departed hence, and that thou hast not broken through the hedge of the wise," quoting Eccles. x. 8, "He who breaketh through a hedge, a serpent shall bite him."[1] Another story of him is that he was met by Rabbi Eliezer in the street of Sepphoris, and gave to the Rabbi a Halacha, or legal decision, which pleased him, on Deut. xxiii. 19. But when Eliezer repeated this, he got into trouble by being accused of sympathy with the Christian heretics.[2] Whether these and other anecdotes have in them any truth or not, they at least show the importance of St. James's position in the traditional recollections of the Jews.

It was one of the wild legends of the Jews, which yet hid beneath it a meaning even deeper than they imagined, that before the city fell the Shechinah had gone to the Mount of Olives, and for three years had pleaded with the people of Jerusalem in vain. The Shechinah, the Metatron, the Divine Son, the effulgence of God's glory, had indeed pleaded and had vanished; but in the teaching of St. James there was still left the echo of that tender patriotism in which He had bewailed the obduracy of guilty Jerusalem. Yet even to this

[1] Midrash Koheleth, i. 8 (in Wünsche's *Biblioth. Rabbinica*, p. 15).

[2] See Wünsche, p. 14; Grätz, iv. 47; Derenbourg, *Palest.* 359. The chronological difficulties go for nothing in the looseness of the Talmud as to such matters.

human voice of the fellow-citizen whom they reverenced, and who had not kindled their burning hatred by any denunciation of the things wherein they trusted, they would not listen. When they murdered the just observer of the Law, they filled to the brim the cup of their iniquity. It was at about this very time that a strange fanatic, who bore the common name of Jesus, appeared in Jerusalem, at the Feast of Tabernacles, and began to make the streets resound with the melancholy cry—

"Woe to the city! woe to the Temple! A voice from the east! A voice from the west! A voice from the four winds! A voice against Jerusalem and the Temple! A voice against bridegroom and bride! A voice against the whole people!"

Annoyed and alarmed by his cries, the people complained of him. The unresisting offender was secured and brought before the Procurator Albinus, but he would answer no question; even the horrible scourging to which he was subjected, until his bones were laid bare, wrung from his lips no other cry than "Woe, woe to Jerusalem!" Unable to extort any answer from him, they released him as a monomaniac; and every year for seven years, at the great yearly feasts, he traversed the city with his wailing cry, answering to no man either bad or good, but whether beaten or kindly treated uttering no word but "Woe!" At last, during the siege, he suddenly exclaimed, "Woe, woe to me also!" and a stone from a Roman catapult laid him dead.

The blood of St. James, shed by priests and Zealots, stained the Temple court at Jerusalem, in the year A.D. 63. Three years had not elapsed before the marble floor of the Temple swam with the blood of more than eight thousand Zealots, who stabbed each other in inter-

necine massacre. Hanan, the prime mover in the martyrdom, perished miserably. He was seized by the Idumeans, murdered, and his corpse was flung out naked to dogs and beasts.[1] Six years had not elapsed before priests, swollen with hunger, were seen madly leaping into the altar flames.[2] Seven years had barely elapsed before city and Temple sank into charred and blood-stained heaps, and the place, the nation, the ritual of Judaism were for ever swept away.

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;
Though in patience long He waiteth, yet He surely grindeth all."

[1] The eulogy which Josephus pronounces on the younger Hanan in his *Jewish War* (iv. 5, § 2), where he attributes to his death the precipitation of the ruin of Jerusalem, is quite inconsistent with the severe remarks which he applies to him in the *Antiquities* (xx. 9, § 1). But when he had any purpose to serve, Josephus was not in the least to be trusted.

[2] Hegesippus says that he was martyred the year before the siege of Jerusalem; but this does not agree with the date of the Procuratorship of Albinus, and the deposition from the Priesthood of the younger Hanan (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 9, § 1).

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

By the Rev. CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

LIBRARY EDITION (*Twenty-eighth Edition*). Two Vols., 8vo, cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

ILLUSTRATED EDITION. With about 300 Original Illustrations. Extra crown 4to, cloth gilt, 21s.; morocco or calf, 42s.

POPULAR EDITION. Cloth, 6s.; cloth gilt, 7s. 6d.; Persian morocco, 10s. 6d.; tree-calf, 15s.

"Dr. Farrar's qualifications for this great work are in many respects eminent. As a distinguished linguist, he is capable of appreciating as few men can the results of textual criticisms; as an accomplished scholar, he is familiar with all the illustrations which literary knowledge can bring to bear on the subject; while, as an earnest divine, he is keenly alive to the spiritual significance of the words and deeds he is narrating. . . . The value of the book in reference to sceptical objections will be that it exhibits in a most favourable form the aspect which the life of Christ bears when regarded from an orthodox point of view. No thoughtful mind will rise from the perusal of this book without feeling that it reveals a beautiful and a harmonious conception. It will serve to raise the mind from mere objections in detail to a comprehensive view of the whole subject, and it will at least assist candid objectors to do justice to the Christian tradition."—*The Times.*

"Dr. Farrar may certainly be congratulated upon a literary success to which the annals of English theology present no parallel. . . . It is impossible, in the space at our disposal, to do justice to what we feel the most valuable element of Dr. Farrar's work—the art, namely, with which he places us in the presence of the Great Teacher, and enables us not merely to follow the trains of His thought, but often to detect their subtle source, or trace them in their secret working upon the minds of friendly or hostile listeners."—*Quarterly Review.*

"We have in every page the result of an intimate acquaintance with the literature bearing upon his great subject, while the quotations and references in the notes more especially intended for the learned reader substantiate the author's claim that, 'without intending to be exhaustive or specially erudite,' his pages 'contain much that men of the highest learning have thought and ascertained.' . . . We pass to our Lord's teaching. In no department of his difficult work, we think, has Dr. Farrar more strikingly displayed his literary ability than in the skill with which he has condensed the larger discourses of Christ—*e.g.*, the 'Sermon on the Mount'—and brought out their salient points, with a clear apprehension of the meaning of His words, and the impression they made on those who heard them. No part will be read with greater pleasure or advantage."—*Guardian.*

"Except in translations from the German, we have no Life of Christ which at once embodies the results of modern Biblical science, and commends itself to those who retain a hearty faith in the Gospel Christ came to be and to teach. . . . It was, therefore, a happy thought which led Messrs. Cassell, Petter & Galpin to resolve on issuing a Life of Christ which, while it embraced the most recent discoveries of Biblical science and criticism, should address itself to the general reader, and place them at his command. A scholarly yet popular Life of Christ was much wanted by the thousands who teach in our schools, and by the tens of thousands who now read and study the Gospels for themselves. This want has been met, fully and admirably, by the Life now before us."—*Nonconformist.*

"The volumes furnish at once the most scholarly and suggestive contributions to Christology published, at least in England, for many years. Dr. Farrar has spared no labour to arrive at accuracy on every point."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

"One knows not which to admire most, the extent of the scholarship exhibited, or the beauty of the style in which the book is written. The work is a monument of the erudition and the piety of the learned author."—*Newcastle Chronicle.*

"It will, in our opinion, take the place in our day which Jeremy Taylor's 'Life of Christ' filled in his. In scholarship, in criticism, in learning, it is abreast with our time. *But it stands among modern Lives alone for its deep piety, its reverent spirit, and especially its wealth of illustration and splendour of rhetoric.* In these last the spirit of the Bishop of Down seems to live again."—*New York Church Journal.*

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO., LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE LIFE AND WORK OF ST. PAUL.

By the Rev. CANON FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

LIBRARY EDITION (*Eighteenth Thousand*). Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

ILLUSTRATED EDITION, with numerous Engravings from original designs and Photographs taken on the spot, Maps, &c. Now publishing in Monthly Parts, 7d.

"The real excellences of the book are such as to warrant our recommending its careful study to those who desire to obtain an adequate view of the moral grandeur and complex variety of the Apostle's character, and of the extent and fruitfulness of his labours."—*Guardian.*

"Next in importance and commanding interest to the life of the Founder of our religion stands that of the famous Apostle of the Gentiles; and Dr. Farrar, having in his 'Life of Christ' given ample and clear proof of his competence to deal with so grand and weighty a theme, has again displayed an equal amount of learning, eloquence, and skill in two remarkable volumes, entitled 'The Life and Work of St. Paul.' Regarding the work as a whole, it is difficult to exaggerate the completeness with which he has accomplished his difficult task."—*Standard.*

"Canon Farrar, in drawing this expressive and animated portraiture of the Apostle of the Gentiles, has laid all classes of Christians under obligations, and thousands will gain from his pages a truer, richer, and more life-like conception of the character and work of St. Paul than it was possible for them to obtain before."—*Daily News.*

"The great Apostle to the Gentiles is brought before the reader in clear and definite outlines, while the background of the portrait has been filled in with a minuteness of picturesque and scholarly detail which few living writers could have compassed. Not less careful is the portrayal of the minor characters who were brought into connection with St. Paul during his career. Each has his own individuality traced with a firm hand, guided by the inspiration of deep reading."—*Globe.*

"The main design of these two full and elaborate volumes will commend itself to every student of Holy Scripture. . . . There can be no question as to the value and importance of his labours. . . . He has noble ideas of a biographer's functions, and no doubt has done his utmost to realise them."—*Saturday Review.*

"The theme is evidently congenial; and the author has thrown himself into it with all the energy and ability of his nature. Amid numerous specimens of excellent exposition, we may refer to the thirty-seventh chapter in particular, which treats at considerable length of St. Paul's theology in connection with the Epistle to the Romans."—*Athenæum.*

"We must congratulate the author on a work which is not only his own literary *chef-d'œuvre*, but is also out of sight the best English work of its class."—*British Quarterly Review.*

"In truth, when one has thoroughly realised the vast and unwearied labour expended in laying the foundations for this work, one is compelled to admire more and more the genius which has been able so effectually to mould it, and to light it up with the sufficing elements of human interest."—*Nonconformist.*

"These two volumes by Canon Farrar are a noble sequel to his beautiful and universally admired 'Life of Christ.' It is superfluous to say that the spirit of an intense and overpowering love to Christ, and of a boundless sympathy with the unrivalled hero of his story, breathes through every page of Canon Farrar's volumes. Dr. Farrar will for ever take his place among 'the masters in English theology,' and 'the classic preachers of the English Church.'"—*Watchman.*

"So long as volumes like these continue to be written and circulated in this country we need have no fear for 'the faith which remains unmoved,' or for our British Christianity, to which Canon Farrar in these recent years has been enabled to do such splendid service."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO., LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

SELECTIONS FROM

Messrs. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Publications.

The Early Days of Christianity. By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, Author of "The Life of Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," &c. Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s. (*Can also be had with morocco binding.*)

The Life of Christ. By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

POPULAR EDITION, in One Volume, extra crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.; cloth, gilt edges, 7s. 6d.; Persian morocco, 10s. 6d.; tree calf, 15s.

ILLUSTRATED EDITION, 4to, cloth, 21s.; calf or morocco, £2 2s.

LIBRARY EDITION. *28th Edition.* Two Vols., 8vo, cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

The Life and Work of St. Paul. By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster.

LIBRARY EDITION (*18th Thousand*). In Two Vols., demy 8vo, cloth, 24s.; morocco, £2 2s.

ILLUSTRATED EDITION, now publishing in Monthly Parts, 7d.

An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. By various Writers. Edited by the Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vol. I., extra crown 4to, price 21s., contains the PENTATEUCH, by the following Authors:—

GENESIS, by the Very Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.
EXODUS, by the Rev. G. RAWLINSON, M.A., Canon of Canterbury.
LEVITICUS, by the Rev. Dr. GINSBURG.
NUMBERS, by the late Rev. Canon ELLIOTT.
DEUTERONOMY, by the Rev. C. H. WALLER, M.A.

This Work—the companion and complement to BISHOP ELLICOTT'S *well-known "New Testament Commentary"—will be completed in Four Volumes.*

A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. Edited by the Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Complete in 6 Vols. Extra crown 4to, gilt cloth, price £3 3s.; or, in half morocco, £4 14s. 6d. the Set.

VOL. I., PRICE 21s., CONTAINS—

ST. MATTHEW. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.
ST. MARK. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.
ST. LUKE. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.
ST. JOHN. By Ven. Archdeacon WATKINS, M.A.

VOL. II., PRICE 21s. CONTAINS—

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.
ROMANS. By Rev. W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D.
CORINTHIANS I. By Rev. T. T. SHORE, M.A.
CORINTHIANS II. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D.
GALATIANS. By Rev. W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D.

VOL. III., PRICE 21s., CONTAINS—

EPHESIANS. By Rev. Canon BARRY, D.D.
PHILIPPIANS. By Rev. Canon BARRY, D.D.
COLOSSIANS. By Rev. Canon BARRY, D.D.
THESSALONIANS I. and II. By Rev. Canon MASON, M.A.
TIMOTHY I. and II. By Rev. Canon SPENCE, M.A.
TITUS. By Rev. Canon SPENCE, M.A.
PHILEMON. By Rev. Canon BARRY, D.D.
HEBREWS. By Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D.
ST. JAMES. By Rev. E. G. PUNCHARD, M.A.
ST. PETER I. By Rev. Canon MASON, M.A.
ST. PETER II. By Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A.
ST. JOHN: Epistles I., II., and III. By Rev. W. M. SINCLAIR, M.A.
ST. JUDE. By Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A.
THE REVELATION. By Rev. Canon CARPENTER, M.A.

A Commentary on the Revised Version of the New Testament for English Readers. By Prebendary HUMPHRY, B.D., Member of the Company of Revisers of the New Testament. 496 pages. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London; Paris; and New York.

S. P.—982

The Child's Life of Christ. Complete in One handsome Volume, with about 200 Original Illustrations. Demy 8vo, cloth gilt, 21s.

Roberts's Holy Land. Division I., Jerusalem and Galilee. Division II., The Jordan and Bethlehem. Each containing 42 Tinted Plates. Royal 4to, cloth gilt, 18s. each.

Companion to the Revised Version of the English New Testament. By Professor ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D., Member of the New Testament Revision Company. Price 2s. 6d.

St. George for England. And other Sermons preached to children. By the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Cloth, gilt edges, 5s.

Shortened Church Services and Hymns, for Use at Children's Services. Compiled by the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A. *Enlarged Edition.* Price 1s.

Some Difficulties of Belief. By the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A. *New and Cheaper Edition.* Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Life of the World to Come, and other Subjects. By the Rev. T. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE, M.A. Cloth, 5s.

The Book of Sacred Poems. Edited by the Rev. Canon BAYNES, M.A. With about 200 Illustrations. *Cheap Edition.* Crown 4to, 400 pp., cloth, 5s.; gilt edges, 6s.

The Family Prayer Book. Edited by Rev. Canon GARBETT, M.A., and Rev. S. MARTIN. *Cheap Edition.* Extra crown 4to, cloth, 5s.

Moses and Geology; or, The Harmony of the Bible with Science. By SAMUEL KINNS, Ph.D., F.R.A.S. With numerous Illustrations. *Second Edition.* Cloth, 10s. 6d.; cloth gilt edges, 12s. 6d.

Family Prayers Prepared by a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. Published by Authority of the House. 1s.

The Bible Educator. Edited by the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., assisted by some of our most eminent Scholars and Divines. With about 400 Illustrations. Four Vols., cloth, 6s. each; or Two Vols., cloth, 21s.

The Family Bible. With 900 Illustrations, Critical and Explanatory Notes, &c. Printed on Fine Toned Paper, leather, gilt edges, £2 10s.

The Guinea Bible. With 900 Illustrations. Royal 4to, 1,476 pages, cloth gilt, gilt edges, 21s.; or 25s. strongly bound in leather.

The Half-Guinea Illustrated Bible. With 900 Original Illustrations. Crown 4to, cloth, 10s. 6d. **** Can be also had in Leather Bindings, suitable for Presentation.*

Selections from Messrs. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Publications (continued).

The Doré Bible.

Royal 4to Edition. Complete in Two Vols., with 220 Illustrations by GUSTAVE DORÉ. Plain morocco, £4 4s.; best morocco, £6 6s.

The Bible Dictionary.

With nearly 600 Illustrations. One Volume, 21s.

Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer.

By the Rev. FREDERIC CAVAN BLYTH, M.A. Cloth, price 7s. 6d.

Sunday.

Its Origin, History, and Present Obligation, considered in the Bampton Lectures (1860). By Archdeacon HESSEY, D.C.L. 6s.

The Child's Bible.

With 200 Original Illustrations. Being a Selection from the Holy Bible, in the Words of the Authorised Version. *125th Thousand.* Cloth, gilt edges, £1 1s.

Daily Devotion for the Household.

Containing a short Prayer, with a Hymn and a Portion of Scripture for Every Morning and Evening in the Year. Illustrated. £1 15s.

The Quiver.

An Illustrated Religious Magazine. Yearly Volumes, 7s. 6d.; also published in Monthly Parts, price 6d.

The Doré Scripture Gallery of Illustrations.

Containing 250 Drawings of Scripture Subjects, by GUSTAVE DORÉ, with Text by EDMUND OLLIER. Two Vols., £5 10s.

The History of Protestantism.

By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D. Complete in Three Vols., containing upwards of 600 ILLUSTRATIONS. Extra crown 4to, cloth, 27s.

English Religion, Illustrations of.

By Professor HENRY MORLEY. Being VOL. II. of "Cassell's Library of English Literature." Illustrated. Cloth, 11s. 6d.

Keble's Christian Year.

With Illustrations on nearly every page. Reprinted from the Original Edition. Cloth, 7s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges 10s. 6d.

The History of the English Bible.

By the Rev. F. W. MOULTON, M.A., D.D. Reprinted, with Additions and Corrections, from "The Bible Educator." Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Pilgrim's Progress and Holy War.

With 200 Wood Engravings and 12 Chromo Plates. Demy 4to, cloth, £1 5s.

Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.

With 100 ILLUSTRATIONS by SELOUS and PRIOLO. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

Bunyan's Holy War.

With 100 ILLUSTRATIONS by SELOUS and PRIOLO. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

The Ingoldsby Letters on the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

By Rev. J. HILDYARD, B.D. Two Vols., 10s.

The Young Man in the Battle of Life.

By the Rev. DR. LANDELS. Stiff covers, 1s.; cloth, 2s.; cloth gilt, 3s. 6d.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.: Ludgate Hill, London; Paris; and New York.

Selections from Messrs. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.'s Publications (continued).

Heroines of the Mission Field.

By Mrs. EMMA RAYMOND PITMAN. Illustrated throughout. Cloth, gilt, 5s.

Mission Life in Greece and Palestine.

By Mrs. EMMA RAYMOND PITMAN. Illustrated throughout. Cloth, gilt, 5s.

The Christian in his Relations to the Church, the World, and the Family.

By the Rev. DANIEL MOORE, M.A. 1s. 6d.

The True Glory of Woman.

By the Rev. DR. LANDELS. Cloth gilt, gilt edges, 3s. 6d.

The Patriarchs.

By the Rev. W. HANNA, D.D., and the Rev. Canon NORRIS, B.D. With Coloured Map. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Music of the Bible.

With an Account of the Development of Modern Musical Instruments from Ancient Types. By JOHN STAINER, M.A., Mus. Doc. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

History of the Waldenses.

By the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D. With Illustrations. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Flowers from the Garden of God.

A Book for Children. By Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

The Voice of Time.

By JOHN STROUD. *New Edition.* Cloth gilt, 1s.

Shall We Know One Another?

By the Rt. Rev. J. C. RYLE, Bishop of Liverpool. *New Edition.* Cloth gilt, 1s.

Rays from the Realms of Nature; or, Parables of Plant Life.

By Rev. J. NEIL, M.A. With Fifty Engravings, 3s. 6d.

Small Sermons on Great Texts.

By J. M. CLABON. Demy 8vo, cloth, price 3s. 6d.

The Religious Revolution in the Sixteenth Century.

By the Rev. STEPHEN A. SWAINE. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 2s.

The Huguenots.

By GUSTAVE MASSON. 1s.; or, cloth gilt, 2s.

John Wesley.

By Rev. R. GREEN. 1s.; or, cloth gilt, 2s.

The Rev Rowland Hill, Preacher and Wit.

By F. BROOME. With Introduction by Rev. J. STOUGHTON, D.D. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 2s.

The Scottish Covenanters.

By the Rev. J. TAYLOR, D.D., F.R.S.E. 1s.; or cloth gilt, 2s.

COMPLETE CATALOGUES OF MESSRS. CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS, *containing a List of Educational Works, Dictionaries, Fine-Art Volumes, Children's Books, Histories, Natural History, Household and Domestic Treatises, Handbooks and Guides, Science, Travels, &c. &c., together with a Synopsis of their numerous Illustrated Serial Publications, sent post free on application to*
CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO., *Ludgate Hill, London.*